DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 060 782 HE 002 878

AUTHOR Borders-Patterson, Anne, Ed.
TITLE The New College Teacher.
INSTITUTION Regional Educational Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Durham, N.C.
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 91p.; Proceedings of the First Annual Faculty Development Conference, November 8-9, 1968, Raleigh, North Carolina

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *College Teachers; Educational Change; *Faculty; *Higher Education; Improvement Programs; *Planning; Professors

ABSTRACT

In 1968 an orientation conference was held by the Educational Improvement Component of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia (RELCV) to explore the problems and opportunities facing young teachers. The administrators and new teachers discussed such matters as typical problems of instruction in their institutions, the particular needs of students, experimental programs and innovations in American colleges and universities, the distribution and redistribution of power on the college campus, the effects of social changes on colleges, students as prime innovators, decisionmaking, the role of the faculty, and the relationships among students, faculty and administration. It is felt that the conference served as a point of entry and a natural springboard for the RELCV involvement with these and other major problems related to instructional, faculty and curricular improvement. (Author/HS)

PROCEEDINGS FIRST ANNUAL FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE

THE NEW COLLEGE TEACHER

Sheraton-Sir Walter Hotel
Raleigh, North Carolina
November 8-9, 1968

Sponsored by
Regional Education Laboratory
for the Carolinas and Virginia

Edited by
Anne Borders-Patterson
Director, Clearinghouse Project

HE 002 878

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia is a private non-profit corporation established under provisions of Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Of the fifteen Laboratories located across the nation, RELCV is the only one with major responsibilities in higher education.

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the USOE and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

REGIONAL EDUCATION LABORATORY
FOR THE CAROLINAS AND VIRGINIA
relcv
MUTUAL PLAZA DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA 27701 TELEPHONE 919-688-8057

CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Expectations versus Realities **John U. Monro**	1
Motivation: Turning Students On **Walter Daniel**	8
The Freshman Year and the Black Perspective **Finley Campbell**	12
The Two-Year College **W. Thomas Cottingham**	25
The College, the Curriculum and Reformation **Gerald Shinn**	30
Experimentation and Innovation in Higher Education **Donal S. Jones**	35
General Aims and Functions of the College **Samuel D. Proctor**	48
Policy and Decision Making **Dale V. Ulrich**	54
Participation of New Faculty in the Total College Program **Mereb E. Mossman**	61
The College President as Teacher **Mervin Freedman**	69
Biographical Sketches	79
Conference Program	82
Appendix: Participating Institutions	85

FOREWORD

The New College Teacher, an area of concern of the Educational Improvement Component of the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia (RELCV), was the theme of an orientation conference held in Raleigh, North Carolina, November 8-9, 1968. The papers published in this monograph provided the framework for this meeting of college administrators and junior faculty members from about 50 institutions in the three-state region. Mrs. Anne Borders-Patterson of the RELCV staff served as conference chairman and editor of this publication.

Problems and opportunities facing young teachers was the focus of the conference. The administrators and new teachers, usually considered to be at opposite ends of the spectrum, discussed such matters as typical problems of instruction in their institutions, the particular needs of students, experimental programs and innovations in American colleges and universities, the distribution and redistribution of power on the college campus, the effects of social changes on colleges, students as prime innovators, decision making, the role of the faculty, and relationships among students, faculty and administration.

In the spring of 1967 the RELCV established the Clearinghouse project for the purpose of bringing qualified prospective teachers together with colleges in the three-state region having vacant faculty positions. The Clearinghouse, under the direction of Mrs. Borders-Patterson, also assumed responsibility for follow-up and orientation of the teachers it placed, who for the most part were young and inexperienced and from outside the region.

The first group of Clearinghouse teachers met in June, 1968 with Laboratory staff and consultants to review the project and to suggest other activities that would deal specifically with (1) problems of the new college teacher, (2)

how the new teacher can make a constructive contribution to the college community, and (3) the broad area of faculty development in general.

Faculty participation, or the lack of it, in colleges and universities is one of the major questions which underlies many of the controversial issues facing higher education today. This question is raised with regard to such issues as the relevance and quality of instruction and curriculum; curriculum reform; new approaches to the evaluation and reward of faculty members; the participation of the faculty in planning, decision making and academic governance; and pre- and in-service education of college teachers.

While these are not the only issues confronting higher education, they have continued to gain momentum on many campuses across the country. These problems are of such magnitude, however, as to require concentrated attention and new approaches if solutions are to be found.

The conference, *The New College Teacher*, and the Clearinghouse project in general have therefore served as a point of entry and a natural springboard for the RELCV involvement with these and other major problems related to instructional, faculty and curricular improvement.

April 10, 1969 Everett H. Hopkins

PANEL: Problems and Opportunities Facing the New College Teacher

EXPECTATIONS VERSUS REALITIES

John U. Monro

It is a great pleasure to be with you. I am very much impressed by the work of this laboratory, and most particularly I wish that we in Alabama had the services of the office that called this meeting together.

It seems to me that one of our tough problems in community colleges (with virtually an open admission system) is that we have students who do clearly belong in college, and many who will almost surely drop out. One thing can be said about almost all our students: they are inadequately prepared for college. What we have to do is to work up a system which will help all students develop and show the abilities they have in the classroom. And the wide spread of abilities is hard for young teachers to accommodate.

Another disparity is the difficulty that the young white teacher has in spanning from his own background and college experience across to his new responsibilies in the predominantly Negro college in the South.

Another disparity we have to cope with has to do with curriculum expectations of the college. Many of the expectations are often not realistic with respect to perhaps half of the students.

Still another disparity lies in the rapid shift in attitudes concerning the degree of institutional responsibility for student failure. When I went to college, the student was considered responsible for himself, and if he failed, that was a sign of a flaw in his character. Everybody understood that, and that made things a lot simpler. But nowadays, if a student fails, it is a flaw not in the student, but in the institution somewhere. And so there is that hang-up—or

ambiguity. We are in the middle of switching from one set of attitudes to another.

Now if you are going to switch over to institutional responsibility, this means developing a large measure of compassion and spending a lot of time on people individually; and this costs money. So much compassion also interferes with standards; it may soften the grading system, or it may conflict with the interest the institution has in turning out people with high grades on the Graduate Record Exam.

The problems of teachers are especially important to me because I am directly responsible at Miles for freshman English and freshman social studies. Our new teachers are recruited during the spring and summer and they often come to us the week before college begins. They have a week or 10 days to gather all the material they can and start teaching. One thing they do not have enough awareness of is the importance of establishing a level of communication in the classroom. What is actually getting across? Who is listening, and how much is the student getting? If you make a reading assignment, how much will the students read? And how much will they understand? Do they do it at all? How well do they take in ideas? Do they respond to the material in any more than a formal way? The faster we can develop answers to these questions the better.

Problems of Classroom Communication

Every teacher has a basic problem of communicating his subject, and it is a matter of frustration for him and his students if he does not discover early what the level of communication is in the classroom and then work with it. The standardized tests will help some on this problem, but not much; it pays to look at them, but it will not do to be governed by them. Some of the students who do poorly on standardized tests will be the best performers in the classroom.

Let me say a word here about lectures. A lot of our young teachers have been taught mostly by lectures; they like to lecture, and this is the image of teaching they bring into the college class. A good preliminary thing to do is to organize carefully a fifteen minute lecture and give it in a slow, carefully outlined delivery. Make a tape recording. Have the students take notes. When you are finished, have the students tell what you have said, and then collect the notes. Better still, let them sit with their notes and play back the lecture; while it is playing back, make an outline on the board of what you thought you were trying to say, and let everybody look at that. Then take the students' notes home, and you will not rely much on lectures again.

Another desirable technique is to section students roughly by ability. I have come at this at different times in different ways. I now group my students roughly in categories as best I can from tests and school records—in groups you could call "A's," "B's," and "C's." Then, when we set up small classes, I try to avoid mixing "A's" and "C's" in the same class. There are some surprises in the results. For example, some of my teachers tell me that supposedly "slower" classes will almost always develop better discussions. The reason may be these students are less inhibited and less shrewd at the "academic game."

For the slower classes in particular the teacher has a special responsibility: he has got to make the effort to simplify what he is trying to teach, to have clearly in mind what he is trying to get at, and to work with the class until they get it. This is hard work, but the teacher has to make the effort. He has got to make limited, manageable assignments, and follow up on them rigorously. And I favor regular use of grades. A systematic, daily employment of grades will help students know how they are doing and will prod them to move along and spend time on hard things they do not especially want to do. I know this sounds old-fashioned, but I believe it works.

As another preliminary device before you do any great amount of reading, give your students a paragraph of reasonably difficult prose—perhaps a few paragraphs in a magazine or some editorial in the newspaper. Ask them to summarize this material in their own words, briefly. The results will tell you exactly how much you will accomplish when you assign a whole chapter of a book. Chances are, this exercise will embark you on a term-long program of summary-writing, or note-taking. Now, is this beneath the dignity of the college? Of course not. It is just a way of establishing a level of communication in your classroom.

Teaching Students to Write

Let's move on to the problem of teaching students to write. I suggest that one of the reasons most students write badly is that the teachers they have had do not write well themselves.

So, most school teachers must try to teach writing out of a composition book. And it won't work. Most of these books were put together by people who can't write either. Anyway, nobody learns writing out of a book, any more than you learn to play the piano by watching Horowitz on television. You learn to write by writing—learning in slow-motion, how to get ideas down into words, words into sentences, and sentences into paragraphs. And the teacher must work endlessly at helping his students develop these skills. There was a great deal of fundamental sense in the old college drill of requiring a freshman theme every day. Teachers generally hate all that paper reading. But people learn to write by writing, not by studying grammar books. I will just add that recent experience makes me think well of the old-fashioned notion of giving students certain formal patterns to follow in constructing a paragraph or an essay.

This is not the place or time to go into details of teaching English composition. The point I want to make is

that all teachers, especially all teachers in freshman courses, have a responsibility to help their students to learn to write intelligible, orderly prose.

I suppose the hardest thing for most young teachers to do is to develop the habit of strict follow-up. I used to hate this in my teachers when I was in school, but I recognize now that systematic, plain, firm, compassionate, but regular, follow-up on assignments is the hard necessary work of good teaching. It is especially important in a situation where most students have never done any homework to speak of, and do not really know what is expected of them.

Faculty and the Administration

Along with all the classroom adjustments, the young teacher has to establish some kind of relationship with administration. One of his problems is that he is not likely to be on campus more than a year—or two at the most. The best way to get along is to realize that at any college there are lots of problems that the administration wants to solve but does not have the time to get at. Any smart young man or woman can pay a little attention, discover some of the problems, and volunteer to take on small, neglected jobs and so establish himself right away as perceptive, intelligent, good citizen.

You can make better mileage that way rather than walking around the administration building with a placard.

Most of us in the black colleges must be prepared for a gradual shift in the level of ability of our students as a consequence of the new recruiting efforts of the large white universities, especially the big state universities here in the South, who are now moving to cream off our better students. This does not mean that in the years ahead we will have any less a job, but we may have a quite different job which could be increasingly a remedial job.

We at Miles can find the able students who cannot pass the test to get into the University of Alabama. And we can

work with them in freshman and sophomore years so they will be fully ready for college work. Thanks to recent studies of the Southern Regional Education Board we know there are at least 75,000 Negro high school boys and girls reaching college age each year in the South who do not get to college, and who have college ability. If all these young people are to get the education they should have there is plenty of work for all of us, but the roles are going to shift. It is the job of the administration in particular to keep their eyes on that, as it affects relationships to high schools, and curriculum, and recruiting of teachers for freshman year.

In particular, I think we must try to get extremely able young teachers and give them a lot of elbow room, of autonomy, in developing their own teaching material. The teacher, ideally, has to feel out what is going on in his class and try to adapt to it; he has got to have elbow room. One by-product of that, if you give a young teacher elbow room and put a lot of responsibility on him, is the kind of adaptation and curriculum invention that we must have. I am just now witnessing such a development from a young teacher in social studies. At the beginning of the year he said, "There is just no sense in my trying to teach these students anything about economics or sociology until they first know how to read and write critically, so I am going to spend the first month teaching them that." I said, "Great, go ahead." He is using material from economics and sociology, and the results are most encouraging. In fact it seems likely that this young social studies teacher will eventually show us how to do our job in freshman English.

If you are trying to do a thorough and compassionate job, you have got to have enough teachers. Miles is persuaded that a good load for each freshman English teacher is 50 students, and a good load for a freshman social studies teacher is 50 students. My young teachers think this load is just great, and I find I am in a good competitive position to hire teachers because the prospect compares so favorably to

what is going on in the high schools. When the teachers get to Miles and see the problem, they realize there is plenty of work in doing a good job for 50 students. But it is a satisfying and rational job for anyone seriously interested in teaching students.

Communication Between the Administration and Faculty

The administration also has a job of keeping in touch with the young teachers, getting to know them, helping them, and having confidence in them. My observation is that most presidents and deans fret and worry too much about young, "radical" teachers, and, as a consequence, do not make very good contact with them. If you do not have a free flow of communication with your radical teachers, they are apt to move out into an intensified relationship with student activists; and then the college will be in trouble. On the other hand, if the young teachers are encouraged to talk and complain, to express their complaints even if you do not agree with them, and to speak out in faculty meetings, they can become some of the most valuable people on the campus. What they want is to improve the institution. They want to do it faster than is practical, and they will be impatient about delays. But ultimately they are responsible citizens, and they are terribly important as individuals who are in touch with the left wing of the student community. The college's job is to take advantage of the intelligence, energy, goodwill and concern they have, and not let it get dammed up and frustrated and transformed into a conspiracy.

PANEL: Problems and Opportunities Facng the New College Teacher

MOTIVATION: TURNING STUDENTS ON

Walter Clarence Daniel

I directed the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Development Program at North Carolina A & T State University last year. This year, I am with the Division of Humanities. I suspect, however, it was that experience with the Thirteen Colleges Program which causes me to be here today.

While listening to Professor Monro, I thought in the event that you wanted to think about something else while I was talking, I would like to motivate you to think about English teachers. What do you do with someone when you propose to teach him his own language? This is a question I like to ask English teachers, and they do not answer it very fast.

I like to discuss this because the youngster who comes to college has been using language for a long time, and as far as he is concerned, he has been using it rather successfully. Now someone says to him, "I am going to teach you your language." If English were a foreign language, he would have the fascination most people have when first learning a few words in a foreign language. Then he has to begin to learn that that language, like his own, has grammar, and he loses interest in it after a while. But I repeat, what do you do with someone when you propose to teach him his own language? At the end of my prepared remarks, perhaps we may say something about that.

As I said, I suspect I have been asked to appear on this panel because of my having served last year as Director of the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Development Program on the campus at A & T State University. And I say with no degree of modesty that that program is a success—and not by

accident. The proposal on which this program was based for thirteen predominantly Negro colleges—about half private and half public, covering (not entirely, of course) an area from Lincoln University in Pennsylvania to Bishop College in Texas—geared itself not to a new psychology, a new machine, or a fascinating gimmick. It was conceived through the conviction that motivation of students, that is, motivation to academic accomplishment—which is our only concern—must be based on curriculum development. The proposal was to "turn on" students, as they often use the term, by "turning on," in these thirteen colleges and universities, a kind of curriculum for 100 members of the freshman class which would be meaningful, relevant, and manageable.

Time will not permit me to describe the program in full, but some of you already know something about it. All of you probably should know about it. We now have some results of the effectiveness of the first year of the program, and we are now moving into the second year of operation. I am certain that the spark which united students to wish to excel in this program was placed there because relevant and significant units of study were constructed out of conventional conceptions of freshman English, social studies, mathematics, and the sciences. No one thought of remediation.

Each student was thought to have, as we often said to ourselves, the constitutional right to fail if he found it necessary to do so. Students were provided with the best instructors the program could provide. Teachers were given sufficient resources with which to teach what was important to teach. Each teacher was given the opportunity to join others in his subject matter field in an eight-week writing conference in the summer preceding the school year. In this fashion, the innovative curriculum and context of the program was shaped.

In English, for example, we set up units of study centered around such things as personal identity, freedom and responsibility. In social studies, we talked about the

present and moved into the nature and history of revolution, the family and the American ghetto. And I believe the students were motivated, mainly because the entire professional staff, both the curriculum staff and the counseling staff, never expressed the slightest doubt that these 1,250 students could achieve—the topics for study had concrete meaning for them.

I was pleased to hear Professor Monro talk about some old-fashioned things; I guess it is simply because we old men tend to think in terms of the values of some things which are old-fashioned. The "hard sell," I think, is one of the necessary things. The students participated fully in their education and, we think, profited from it.

I would like to say that, at my university, 36 of these 100 freshman students made the dean's list by the end of the school year. Each member of the program raised his reading grade placement index by at least two years. Most importantly though, members of the group established among themselves a thinking and working community which made its intellectual impact on the campus even though it was a small group.

I conclude by making the point that I know that these students were "turned on" to learn gladly. But one of the things which disturbs me a bit is that, in talking with many of the students who are now sophomores (many of them starting their majors), I found that they complained that their courses this year do not give them the opportunity to exchange ideas as they did in their experimental freshman year. In fact, two students were saying to me just yesterday that professors in a given department simply don't let them talk as they're used to talking. This is rather interesting and an important point in motivating students.

Let me say that one extreme weakness, which is obvious and inherent here, is that this somewhat ideal situation of the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Development Program can

hardly be carried over into the full college. In most cases there is lack of resources of one kind or another. Moreover, I feel that the development of a relevant, significant curriculum—such as the one we participated in—or at least the study of the results of various similar experiences should, and probably does, provide a way to motivate students to gladly learn what is important to their academic development.

PANEL: Problems and Opportunities Facing the New College Teacher

THE FRESHMAN YEAR AND THE BLACK PERSPECTIVE

Finley Campbell

The approach which I am taking here is to deal with the whole question of the freshman year—across the board—social sciences, physical sciences, humanities, all three divisions as they relate to black students, especially in the South.

I have a suspicion that some of the problems that are supposed to be related uniquely to the black freshman are related, in fact, to the southern freshman in general. Since I have come to the conclusion that there is a kind of student clientele that comes out of the rural areas of the South (and many southern cities are still rural areas in a qualitative sense), I believe there are certain problems in the preparation of of these students that may be different from the so-called northern urban areas, especially as related to the Negro students.

The context for the black southern student is, of course, the broad changes in Negro-southern education generated by the black liberation movement. This revolution, taking place throughout our nation, has forever changed the nature and the meaning of the black college. In addition, this revolution is affecting the white college students as well. If black students are heading toward an authentic blackness in their drive toward making their education more meaningful, then the white students—those who are revolutionary and committed to national reconstruction—are heading toward a mythical blackness. What we see now is a common sharing of a basic rebellion: in fact, white students simply borrowed lock, stock and barrel the whole revolutionary dynamic of

the black liberation movement. Thus, my point is that the current revolution sweeping the college campuses is being generated by black students and their white allies. It is in this revolutionary context that the black southern college and its rural clientele must be seen. So there is a black perspective that may have application all across the board.

Development of Black Colleges

The black colleges in their earlier days were also faced with a revolution: they had the enormous task of transforming ex-slaves and ex-peons into operational citizens. The assumption was that education meant making ex-black slaves white, and by making them white, they would be allowed to survive in a predominantly white culture. And so, there were those miracles which took place in places like Spelman and Morehouse and Fisk, where students fresh out of the agrarian landscape were learning Greek, Latin, philosophy, logic, English, math, theology, history, etc., and they were leaping intellectual borders which had seemed impossible to cross in the old slave times. A strange revolutionary process clustered around places like Howard, Talladega and Atlanta University. The three professions that were usually set up for this type of education were the ministerial (missionaries and preachers), the medical and the teaching professions. During this period, many of the black colleges had preparatory high schools attached to them—the Tuskegee High School, the Morehouse Academy, the Morris College Elementary School. In a clear sense, these academies and high schools allowed the Negro colleges to control, create and train their own students for college, as there was no such thing, in many instances, as a public high school, especially since the defeat of the First Reconstruction.

But even then there was a sense of unreality about this white-oriented education. While it did what it aimed to do,

with the transformation of ex-Africans into Afro-Saxons, it also separated the educated Negro from his untaught brothers. This led to the Du Bois syndrome, to the concept of the "talented tenth." The result was symbolic of future problems even in Du Bois' own life. When Du Bois went South to Tennessee, he discovered that something had been done to his mind. There he was with his Harvard education and all of his Greek and Latin and Western history trying to teach spelling, reading and writing to the people who had hardly ever seen a book. He found himself completely "white" trying to "get back" to blackness, and the thing that was standing in his way was a falsified notion of what education was about for black people—the idea that it was *only* supposed to make them black caucasians. The lynch spirit of Jim Crowism was the constant existential proof that no matter how Saxon an ex-African became, he was still socially, politically and culturally a "nigger."

The second stage in the development of black colleges came between 1925 and 1958. This stage was the separate but equal development. Negro educators gratefully assumed that southern segregationists were sincere about giving Negroes at least an inferior education. The existential "Uncle Toms" recognized that, although the racists were not going to give them equal education, they would at least give black children something that would make them a little better than field hands.

With the coming of separate but equal facilities and with philanthropic money trickling into southern education to help maintain these facilities, black public education became a reality. Suddenly it was no longer necessary for black colleges to have private elementary and secondary schools, so they abandoned them and concentrated on capturing the cream of the graduates from the public schools. Negro colleges became, to some degree, places for an elite—the talented tenth of the black race. Tuskegee and Hampton were, ironically, the only exceptions. They kept a kind of

perverse faith with the poor blacks. The 1925-1958 period was a kind of golden age; there was no other place where these superior educated Negroes could go except back into the community of black people—unless they were lucky enough to get a job in integrated professions in the North, a very rare occurrence. So there was a continual cycle of enrichment taking place within our segregated culture that kept intensifying. Among the black elite and its related lower middle-class, very, very bright blacks were being created. They filled the private and public colleges, and when they became graduates, they created and sustained a variety of commercial and intellectual and religious enterprises—very beautiful and powerful. But it was only for an emerging bourgeoisie, not for the entire race.

The third stage began with the desegregation movement. Nowadays black colleges find themselves losing out to schools which were formerly all white. Talladega finds itself in competition with Auburn; Morehouse in competition with Emory; North Carolina College in competition with Duke; Fisk with Vanderbilt. In fact, many foundations are bank-rolling white institutions to encourage them to take black students and do something with them. North and South, the exceptional black student is finding himself wooed by white scholarships.

Now where does this leave the black college? Some can still attract elite-type students. In some instances, faithful alumni in secondary education are still sending down bright students. But in many instances, the student clientele is no longer composed of the representatives from the talented tenth who used to come from Booker T. Washington High and Carver High and all those other "highs" which had developed a feeder relationship, guided by the alumni, with Negro colleges. Now, they are guiding them to white prestige schools. This leaves the southern Negro schools with a new student clientele: students curiously similar to the ex-slaves of Reconstruction times.

Indeed the black college finds itself, once more, at the first stage of its development, in a symbolic sense. It must, once again, take students who are not really "college material" and prepare them for life. Yet, the black college is using a curriculum structure designed for the second stage. In other words, the so-called liberal arts curriculum is now being applied to students who, if they cannot get a scholarship to Brown or Brandeis or Duke find themselves in black colleges. Ironically, it is not something new that the black colleges are being faced with; but it is something which they have not wanted to face up to: that they are back where they started, back to the first stage—the transformation into black citizens of students who would normally not be considered college material by Phi Beta Kappa standards.

Thus, the colleges maintain structures of education and structures of involvement that grew out of the second historical stage that has long been demolished by the integrationist dynamic. They require two years of foreign languages for students who still have problems in English; they require a year of religion for students interested in the history of American radicalism; they require humanities programs which say nothing to students interested in black consciousness.

Now, don't be misled. Though the new clientele is, technically speaking, unprepared for the typical liberal arts courses, he does have basic intelligence and he is highly motivated. These students know, for example, that they do not want to be truck drivers and maids. They know that an education will allow them to get a G-2 classification in the post office, a job as a teacher; or if they are revolutionary minded they want an education which will prepare them to deal radically with the system.

But between their expectations and the college's concept of education lies a variety of problems. I have attempted to trace in a rather general way the historical bases of these problems:

(A) the rise of a revolutionary situation in race relations in America and
(B) the recent changes in the student clientele of most black colleges.

Negro college admissions offices used to speak about accepting the high school graduate who had the potential to become the totally educated man. Students now ask, "What do you mean, totally educated?" And that is the essence of the variety of problems in which the new teacher will find himself involved at the freshman level. Black pragmatists are professionally oriented; black idealists are nationalistically oriented. Both have conceptions of what a relevant education is and these conceptions differ rather violently from the typical United Negro College administrator. Pragmatist and idealist agree on one thing: they are no longer interested in being made into half-white freaks.

Problems in Instruction

This leads to three basic types of problems in instruction within this broad environmental situation. I have already mentioned the problems related to the traditional conceptions of college education. Then there are those related to *remediation.* For example, why should Fisk set up a remedial math program? Is it not one of the great black colleges in the South? Why should Fayetteville State worry about teaching chemistry on the high school level? Finally, there are those problems related to the push toward blackness. Sometimes the new teacher coming in this situation, particularly if he is a white teacher, discovers both a challenge and an exasperation in all these seemingly conflicting sets of difficulties.

Now what are some of the specific problems in instruction which further complicate these problems? Number one is the problem of the teachers' own *hubris.* Pride is a very subtle thing which many teachers have to face in

themselves. Basically it is a feeling that "you must learn what I have to teach." A better attitude is the assumption that teaching is a process of locating "what *we* are going to learn together." Pride creates an adversary rather than advisory relationship in the classroom. It makes the young M.A., M.A.T., or Ph.D. (especially in the sciences) go to a board and immediately run off formulae and concepts of extraordinary complexity. And if the students do not understand them, it is too bad. Such teachers sit around and talk about the stupidity of their students or moan that they do not even know first principles. It is precisely this pride which causes many new professors not to teach first principles.

There was a young German Ph.D. who taught math at Morehouse, who had such hubris. Once he said to me, "if my majors can't understand calculus, that's their problem." It became his problem when there was talk of rebellion and throwing him out of the classroom. After pride is broken, we are then ready for the other real problems of the classroom.

The second problem for the young teacher is relating to the student, particularly the black student. I would like to suggest some ways which may be helpful. First, it is necessary for the teacher to establish control over the class from the beginning. Too many white teachers assume that because of the history of oppression which the black student has had, they cannot "ask" him to do anything. It will "smack" too much of massa-ism, and so they become over-permissive: "Well, what do you want to do?" (which is just as bad as telling them what to do). What the teacher really wants to do is arrive at a clear sense that he is in fact *the teacher*—that teaching is what he is getting paid for; after all, it is not the student who is paid the salary. The good instructor must somehow *control* the class, but not dominate it or tyrannize it, whatever this may mean to individual people.

The next point is that teachers are not supposed to be buddies with students. This is a hard doctrine. It does not

mean being aloof. It simply recognizes that the teacher is *never* (and this is a terrible reality that many young teachers have to learn) anything to the student but a person who is better trained. I have seen a few teachers whose students call them by their first names, and it has not caused problems. But in most cases, misunderstandings arise, especially about grades. If the teacher is thought of as a buddy, he has automatically destroyed whatever ability he has to flunk that student. Moreover, it leads to ironic hostilities and a complicated situation.

The key is control. Paradoxically, clear patterns of control can lead to a relaxed situation. The black student coming out of a kind of free-wheeling social pattern is often looking for certain forms of structure. Adolescents in general, despite their cry for freedom and more freedom, are in fact looking for something that they can understand as a controlling power, which does not repress or hold them back but which directs them, if you can understand this kind of "soul" distinction.

Third, there is a specific need to insist upon academic excellence in your own competence. You are there to define certain skills the students need. If they wanted to hang around on street corners, they would not be in the classroom. If they wanted simply to be radically revolutionary, they would not be on the campus. You must establish immediately that they are in college, that the college has certain standards and that the function of your class is to get students ready to meet these standards by means of your competence.

One young man said to me, "Mr. Campbell, why should I learn all this stuff when the whole system will be destroyed?" I said, "Well, while we're waiting for the system to be destroyed, you'd better learn how to write papers. When the revolution comes, you can take them and burn them; but until that time comes, I want your essays in on

time." My competence is to teach him how to write essays: either for his revolutionary polemics or for his college work. But whatever the final end, the immediate end is that symbolic.

After you have established a kind of hard-nosed setup in your class, the fourth step is to make yourself available for conferences and personal contact. Teachers say that their students do not talk in class. They do not talk in class because they have other students looking at them. And students will "pick" at each other, particularly in a coed school. So a lot of guys who are very bright just sit in classes like dumb owls because they are looking at their peers rather than at the teacher.

One way a teacher can start to loosen up his students is by developing controlled conferences. Most teachers say, "I have conferences; the door is open! Students can come by any time." Students will not come by freely under these conditions because they will be accused of hanging around the teacher. But if the teacher says, "John Smith, Bill Jones, and Dave Carson will see me for conferences at X o'clock," then they will come, and one can talk with them and discover amazing things.

For example, I was talking with a student about Greek tragedy, and he just sat there and looked absolutely dumb. After talking with him, I found out that his mother was dying of cancer and often he had to care for her. Suddenly, that fact helped me in getting him to understand *Oedipus*, to understand Oedipus' situation as it related to him and to the whole problem of terror, pain and agony. I discovered that he had some awareness which I was not able to see until I had that conversation with him.

Personal contact and conferences are essential, although I know many teachers are from schools where they have classes with 40 to 50 students. I do not know what can be done about that, but one has to take a little time out for this kind of interplay. This is where one really breaks down all

the incrustation of timidity and fear that keeps students from responding in the classroom.

Next, what about teaching techniques? There is a battle going on between compensators and remediators. I think every black college is going through that. The remediators favor the drilling of unprepared students with new math, old math, new grammar, old grammar. Compensators argue that the average low-performing student has had enough of that; that what he needs is enrichment.

I think that a compromise could possibly be made between the two schools via the concept of development. In a sense, you begin with your students at the point of *their* expertise.

You know your students are loaded with ideas, information and data. For example, if your textbooks have not come, you have living textbooks sitting in front of you. People who have been on farms have seen things happen; many of them know something about cars. There is a great deal of information that the student has acquired informally, in his own way. But as soon as he tries to communicate in his own way, we teachers too often are quick to point out errors instead of trying to understand what is being said. Instead, we should guide the students' ideas.

Then let me say a special word to teachers of science. Most science courses have a combination of lectures and laboratory. A device which might be effective in breaking down problems that science teachers may have is the concept of "controlled laboratory experience" where a basic program of common experimentation takes place that will allow the students to be guided by the teacher into the mysteries of physical chemistry or biology. This is especially important in required science courses. Too many times we place our freshmen in a biology course, give them a textbook and a lot of terminology, and then expect them somehow to start from nowhere. But as can be seen in the flunk-out rate, the old

way just "ain't" working.

An awareness through the kinds of experiences that the students have already had—by beginning with the reality of their own lives—the imaginative teacher, whether in English or biology, can begin the process of developing a college student. Indeed, it may come to the point where, in freshman courses, the first few weeks of class will not be spent on some predetermined historical or theoretical basis of the course. We may start by trying to understand the kind of students we have, what they already know and what they can do. Out of such raw material must *develop* the competent college student.

My sixth and last point deals with something called *available* resources. Many educators speak about the *unique* resource; that is, a lump of money which is given for a one or two year project. Beautiful things occur while the money lasts, but because the money runs out or because it is only a one-year grant, everything goes back to normal, i.e., back to chaos.

Then many young teachers at the Negro college get flustered when *promised* resources do not arrive: books, chalk, paper and textbooks. You (the teacher) become frustrated because you are busy depending on forces outside the classroom to furnish you with certain requested items. But even the most inefficient school gives you *available* resources: the classroom, the students and yourselves. Those are basic resources. It is not a textbook that defines the nature of education; rather it is the fact that an aggressive teacher can get textbooks, even if he has to order them and sell them to the students directly. The sooner the teacher learns how to get his own chalk and paper, the sooner he will see that he has been wasting energy, and that the most valuable resource he has is enthusiasm.

The available resources are mimeograph machines, journals and libraries. The committed teachers can locate wealth even in the poorest college, especially when compared

to what was available a hundred years ago. Moreover, some schools have made available to their teachers video tape recorders and audio tape recorders and all kinds of new education media. Other schools have been willing to order paperbacks and supplemental textbooks. And if some schools have no bookstores, then the teacher can order *Ebony* magazine or *Negro Digest* or *Liberation* or *Muhammed Speaks* or any journals that allow one to get immediately the materials he has to have in order to get his class moving while he is waiting for the college to move its bureaucratic joints.

In some cases, the available resource is the new interest in blackness. This interest can also be tied into traditional concepts of education. In order for students to read *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, they have to know how to read. They can learn to appreciate *Oedipus Rex* or *Macbeth* if the teacher shows them the principle of terror and dread that underlies Malcolm X's life, Macbeth's life and Oedipus' life. For example, one assignment which I gave my students was the *Iliad*; I deliberately taught them the *Iliad* because I knew they would think it was completely irrelevant to the black revolution. For an essay, I assigned the topic: "Hector is a black hero, and Achilles is a white guy; rewrite *Book 23* in terms of that situation and use modern terms." So, one student described a scene in which Achilles in a white Cadillac dragged the body of the black hero around a Harlem ghetto, with the brothers inside shouting for revenge. Thus the *Iliad*, an available resource, became relevant to the level of interest and understanding of my students, the other available resource.

I would like to say this to those in biology and physics: they have more resources available to them because of the prestige of science in black colleges. Before a Negro president gets a humanities building, he will have gotten a science building—this is academic law. Hence people in science can write their own ticket. What they cannot write is their preconception of what science courses are for the average

black student. Here the resources are plentiful, but the compassionate concern is limited. In the sciences, there is opportunity to deal meaningfully with student problems precisely because of the power base in the college. The departments of sciences have a chance to lead the way in introducing new forms of teaching—teaching machines, programmed text, group or team instruction. But in too many instances, science departments get trapped in this business of condemning students because they are not ready for college, instead of making them ready for college. And too many science teachers, and in all fields for that matter, pride themselves on how many students they "shoot down," rather than on how many they "bring up."

In the end, whether we are talking about black students or white students, we are really talking about an age-old problem, the problem of instruction, the problem of encouraging the slow student, stimulating the able, training the unprepared and educating them all. When we recognize that things have changed radically in the South as far as education is concerned and that the colleges are still 20 years behind the revolution, we can clearly see that the problem of teaching the freshman—the chief figure in this analysis—is a complex one indeed. For the history of Negro education from 1865 to the present has signalled to us anti-violence in its aim, and the black revolution has signalled to us the urgency of a new education. It is within this turbulent confluence of the past and the present that the white teacher entering the black college must be as gentle as a dove but as wise as a serpent and as tough as nails.

The kind of freshman that the white (and black) teacher can salvage will determine the kind of education which will emerge in the future for the liberation of the black man in America.

PANEL: Problems and Opportunities Facing the New College Teacher

THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

W. Thomas Cottingham

For a number of years the community colleges have been almost messianic as we have talked of the open door policy, democracy's college, the remediation process, the value of counseling, individual attention for the individual student, and not the least of all—good teaching.

At last we are asking ourselves if we are really doing the things that we have boasted about, and we are giving critical attention to teaching. For a long time we have said as we recruited: we do not care about researchers; we just want good teachers. All too often we have tacitly claimed that since we do not involve ourselves in research, therefore, it follows that our major involvement is in good teaching—almost as fallacious as assuming that since Charles has little interest in reading, he must be unusually good at writing.

It seems to me that the destiny of the black college, or the two-year or community college is inextricably bound up with the dedication and competency of its teachers. The two-year and four-year colleges and the universities all say they want students who are motivated, students who are perceptive, possess initiative and independence, students who can think (or welcome the opportunity to learn to do so). Now let us translate this. These teachers are really saying: "We want students who are easy to teach."

If we are looking for such students we will not turn to the community college. While these institutions do have many students who are very bright, there are many who are extremely limited in interest, motivation and past records of performance. But many disturbing findings are flowing in

upon us. Many of our most cherished certainties about abilities and competencies are being shattered. Many of our "unteachables" are being found by new research to be very teachable.

An Experimental Teaching Program

A very exciting program is going on at the Macomb County Community College on the outskirts of Detroit. For several years they have offered a full year of intensive work to entering college students who are in the "lower half" (based on high school records and entering test scores). The college has set up a special division and recruited outstanding teachers who want to teach the "less able" students. Originally, the main aim of this program was to give these students a year of post high school education that would be relevant to them, help improve their self-concepts (very low from long histories of failure) and contribute to their general development as citizens of the community. To the delight of the staff and the amazement of the other teachers, students are leaving this program after a year to move into successful work as sophomores in the regular college programs and they are then transferring to senior institutions with success. Most surprising, the students who made the most progress in the program were those around the twelfth percentile, those whom the administrators had thought of excluding from the program at first because they were not really "teachable".

The two-year colleges are giving extensive attention today to attempts to provide more effective teaching. These institutions could make an enormous contribution to the whole of American education if we could meet with even a little more success than others have in this vital area. We like to believe that we have a number of exemplary teachers who have the skills necessary to turn students on. We hope desperately that these skills can be isolated, analyzed and taught.

Experimental Ventures in Teaching

We now have an experimental program at Gaston College in the area of communications which has given us a great deal of excitement and hope, and has emphasized once again the crucial importance of good teaching. Students with poor records and low scores are being given concentrated instruction and experience in reading, writing, listening and speaking—led by teams consisting of two excellent teachers of English. Though they are blocked in for daily periods of two or even three hours of communications alone, no one subject presentation lasts for over 20 minutes and the teachers vary as well as the areas of subject matter and approach. These students are doing more writing in one quarter than many people do in two years of college (with two teachers in the classroom feedback is often almost immediate) and the progress they have made in written and oral expression is most impressive. Even the most casual observer can see that the way in which they talk, work and exchange ideas with their instructors and with each other comprises an exciting and involving learning environment.

This experimental program has been based upon the following suppositions:

1. If these students experience some success (in contrast with their past failures) their concepts of themselves will improve and they will once again be at least amenable to learning.
2. Though the instructors are bubbling over with things they want to "tell" the students, every effort is made to elicit maximum expression and response from the students themselves through the use of numerous panels, reports, talks and discussions.
3. The shaping of student behavior is best accomplished with positive reinforcement.

Initially the teachers are very supportive. As the confidence of the students increases, they welcome criticism that would have turned them off completely at the beginning.

These classes are experiencing high rates of retention both during the term and from one term to the next. Other teachers and friends note the changes in these students; but best of all, the students note the change in themselves, and have a sense of accomplishment that is extremely rewarding to all of us who have worked with this program.

Central to any success that comes out of this venture is the teacher who sees the enormous potential dividend of highly skilled, dedicated and patient instruction.

At the close of one of the quarters in which the students had been working in the three-hour-a-day communications block, the students said that the experience had been fine and very valuable to them but that what they constantly needed was more class time. What teacher would not glow when faced with such a program criticism!

When one goes into any college, there is usually very close agreement among the administrators, the faculty, and the students on which individuals on the campus are doing the good teaching. The good teacher is an identifiable person and we are going to continue to try to analyze what makes him a good teacher and hopefully show or teach instructors how to improve their effectiveness.

It has often been said that when we have a great promise, we are also fraught with great danger. This seems to be the case in teaching in the two-year college. On the one hand we have this new institution which is fresh, viable, open to new ideas and techniques, open to innovation, and not all bound down with traditions. On the other hand there is within the two-year college, I regret to say, the strong desire to "play university". Ironically, as the senior colleges and universities are breaking away from many of their traditional shackles and saying, "We are going to breathe free and move

out and do some fresh things," some of our community college people are binding themselves up in some of the very shackles discarded by those they are trying to emulate. A wave of faculty reaction of conservatism could seriously hamper if not stop the vigorous search now under way by the two-year colleges for innovative techniques and devices for the increased effectiveness of instruction.

The two-year institutions will do well to make constant effort to recruit effective teachers, maintain in-service programs to develop good teachers, recognize great teaching at whatever level it occurs, and then reward tangibly those teachers who teach most effectively. While good teaching is highly rewarding within itself, the returns, in the wakened interest, motivation and learning in the rising generation of students (which can be initiated or at least enhanced by the good teacher), can be most exciting even to the quietest of minds.

PANEL: Problems and Opportunities Facing the New College Teacher

THE COLLEGE, THE CURRICULUM AND REFORMATION

Gerald Shinn

Most of us would agree, I think, that the academic air is charged today with reexamination and reevaluation of the purpose and intent of what a college is, ought to be, and does. This scrutiny is both meet, right and overdue. We have far too long spoken *ex cathedra* concerning our colleges without research to support and give direction to our academic activities.

There is one area of the college, however, which is being singularly neglected, and the reasons for this neglect are legion. It is the most sacrosanct, unapproachable, confusing and complex of all the members of the academic body. This most important member of the *collegium* is the curriculum, for the curriculum is what guides, or is supposed to guide, the thinking of the academic community of scholars.

The curriculum not studied? Neglected? Why if there is one entity that is investigated to virtual paralysis on most college campuses it is the curriculum. But the question might be raised, "What kind of study is conducted on the curriculum?" Normally, a curriculum study is confined to simple calculations of what courses are offered in the college catalogue and what courses are actually taught. Few curriculum researchers are asking the questions: "What is a curriculum? What is its purpose?" Or, "Why do we include a particular course in the curriculum for our department?" It seems that curricula, like pre-pill children, were not planned; they were accidents of the romance between an administration and a faculty. Frequently, moreover, it was and is a case of love's labor lost.

What is a curriculum? Unfortunately, it has kept its original Latin meaning: *curriculum* was the chariot race

course in the *circus maximus.* It still is. The administration and faculty plan the race course and place sundry obstacles at frequent intervals over which the students must leap. The race must be completed in four years, and the swiftest runner who clears the hurdle highest receives the victory laurel: "magna cum laude," greatness with honor.

Catalogue Curriculum

Let us not make the mistake, however, of equating successful runners with educated persons. Instead of a one-to-one correlation, the correlation is almost zero. Those who have been the most successful academic athletes have often learned the least. Why? The contention of my remarks is that the formal overt catalogue curriculum at most colleges thwarts genuine learning. The basic presupposition of the catalogue curriculum is that students' minds are passive agents. True, students are actively running the race course, but they are kept so physically busy that their intellectual capacities are not challenged and freed. They do a lot of memorizing, but they do not think—they are not working with their minds. They can solve old problems with old solutions that were done in the classroom, but they do not know how to recognize new problems and find new solutions to them. It is, therefore, no surprise to learn that the majority of the courses in the formal catalogue curriculum are lecture courses in which the students write down each divine professorial dictum and then regurgitate them all with precision on quizzes. Small wonder that significant learning does not take place in the college classroom. The formal curriculum often becomes a millstone around the students' necks that hinders them from general knowledge and wisdom.

Hidden Curriculum

But there is another, unofficial curriculum on the

college campus which investigates and enhances the intellectual life. This is the hidden curriculum initiated by the students; it is student-oriented, it is vibrant, it is often impromptu and corresponds far more with reality than does the catalogue curriculum. In the hidden curriculum, there are no classes, and there are no textbooks. Instead, there are dialogues and primary sources. Instead of the methodology of memorization and regurgitation, there is the methodology of research and inquiry.

Here are some of the course offerings in the hidden curriculum in most colleges:

Dating 101-102—a freshman course in the preliminary *art of attracting and pursuing the opposite sex.* No prerequisites.

Dating 212-213—a sophomore continuation course. No outside reading required. Frequent labs.

Testing and measurements 101-102—a freshman continuation course in the fundamental art of aceing fill-in-the-blank and true-false tests. Prerequisites: a coin and a long-sleeved white shirt with starched cuffs.

Adolescent Psychology 201—an in-depth study of the faculty mind.

Physics 116—a freshman research course in the design, construction and control of linear accelerators..

Reformation of the Curriculum

Although there are other examples that might be cited which would be facetious, the point is serious. At present the two curricular models found on most college campuses are separated by a deep and dark chasm from which comes the sound of protest and riot. The catalogue curriculum stifles significant learning. The hidden curriculum liberates the students' minds. The former is faculty-initiated and administration directed; the latter, student-initiated and directed. Now some means should be found to bring these

two curricular models together and infuse the merits of the hidden into the catalogue curriculum. The lecture should become, at least in large part, a dialogue. Memorization ought to become inquiry. Regurgitation ought to become research. For these changes to occur a full-scale reformation of the innate structure and operation of the college curriculum would be required. But what is *not* being called for here is a revolution, for a revolution sweeps away everything, and in spite of its inhibiting nature, there are still some things worth salvaging in the academic body. Now if one agrees that reformation is necessary for the prognosis of our patient for the college to improve and survive, what type of reforming treatment is to be recommended?

Almost invariably it is the new young faculty member who spots reforms that should be made. And what are you going to do about them? Well, you cannot sit still because you have to live with your conscience, and if you are not careful, you will be without a job or at least teaching somewhere else next year.

How To Reform

The following are some practical suggestions for starting a reformation, which have been beaten out on the steel anvil of experience. One, instead of a demonstration, call for an examination of the college curriculum and its meaning. Second, never try it alone; faculties are overwhelmed and overburdened with Don Quixotes dashing around, jousting truculent windmills. So get together, caucus, get allies. And when you get allies and talk, sometimes your ideas get changed a little, and they become more realistic. Third, involve all three nations of the college—the faculty, the administration, and the students in the reformation, because if you do not that reformation will never leave the launching pad.

Give yourself the chance to collect ideas from others.

No one person has good ideas all the time, not even the dean. Fourth, get the facts and publish them; use any and all measures available from the Educational Testing Service or others to complete a climate survey with faculty, administration and students. Before you reform, find out what you are reforming. Be aware of *all* aspects of the situation before you begin a reformation. Finally, for genuine change to occur and reformation to be realized, both must continue. A reformation must continually reform itself even to the point of confessing that it was and is wrong.

Instead of two conflicting curricula on the college campus let there be one, but let it be based upon inquiry, nurtured by research and fed by open dialogue.

DISCUSSION:

EXPERIMENTATION AND INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Donal S. Jones

I have a few intemperate words to shell on you, which I hope may provoke you in turn to both talk and discuss. We have here two groups of people—administrators and their junior faculty—who ordinarily keep a decent distance apart and for very good reasons. Although I lack the formal power to do so, I would like to try at least informally to grab a certain kind of immunity from prosecution for the new teachers. This might allow them to ask the administrative people some of the questions which I know they have and allow some of the administrators to speak very directly to the new teachers. Perhaps if we all sign a pledge that there will be no retaliation then people can speak up.

I would like to raise a few issues which are related to my view of innovation in colleges. First of all, I am convinced that significant innovation in American colleges and universities is either immensely difficult or completely impossible. I can define "significant innovation" very precisely. It probably has little or nothing to do with curriculum, but the formal curriculum has never been very important anyhow. It has to do with the shift in the distribution of power in the institution. And I think significant innovation in any institution, whether it is a college or not, is measured by a significant shift or change in the distribution of power in that institution. It is unlikely, I think, that most American colleges and universities can tolerate or will allow substantial shifts in the distribution of power. Yet such shifts are what I mean by significant innovation.

It seems to me that where significant innovations have occurred in institutions of higher education, they have often come not from people within the institution but from outside forces. They have been by-products of technological change in society as a whole—a result of massive demographic shifts of people who migrated from other parts of the country. The only conceivable source of significant innovation in an institution, in my opinion, is the student body.

It seems to me that the faculty is nearly completely locked into the institution. The administration, to an ever greater degree, is locked into the institution in ways that the faculty usually does not understand. Students do not have much to lose; they can afford to innovate. So I would say that, if significant innovation is going to occur, it is going to originate with the students.

Innovation is the area in which most of us would actually be able to think seriously about having some impact. Let me concentrate specifically on the individual faculty member who might want to innovate significantly. He has one area that he largely controls and within which his power holds. That area is, of course, the classroom—where he alone determines the content of what goes on with students during a given class hour. This is a protected area which he can defend even if the administrators do not like what he is doing. It is a little difficult for them to intrude overtly. There is some power there, and the college teacher can redistribute that power or shift the way in which that power is established or conferred among the people present in that room at that time. He can, in fact, turn some of his power over to the students in the classroom situation, and that, in turn, may have some very interesting consequences. It is not going to change the course of higher education, but I think it is a process worth examining.

My thesis is that innovations relate not so much to content or process, but to a redistribution of power and

decision making.

Dr. Shinn talked about the hidden curriculum—what students learn about life and one another outside the classroom—and this, I think, is the basic course in the college. But there is one thing that the formal curriculum does that I believe is advantageous—it gives a number of people whose ego needs are very powerful, namely faculty members, a chance to have something about which they can argue, about which they can appear to make decisions.

Somebody has asked why apparently all faculty meetings are such intolerable occasions. I think there is a very simple reason: faculty meetings assemble in one room a large number of people, every one of whom knows he is extremely important, but no one of whom has any significant decision-making authority. Therefore, what you have to do is somehow manufacture a situation, allow everyone to dig in, take a position, defend it, argue, and so forth. It reminds me of what happens in a junior high school when you convene student leaders.

Suppose it is a course description you are haggling over. I do not think it matters what the paragraph says that comes out in the catalogue, because the course will vary with whoever teaches it. Secondly, it may not be taught the next year. You know all these things, but I think it is important to look at these activities and the roles they play in the institution and the way in which they provide some of the cement that holds the institution together.

As one example of what I consider to be a real and significant innovation in American higher education, let me refer to the black studies programs which are being instituted at some colleges and universities. I think this is an innovation because one clear aim of these programs is to redistribute the power on campus. Often such a move will begin when black students on a largely white campus organize themselves to exert more leverage on institutional decision making than was previously the case. The movement may attract some faculty.

I think it is important in looking at the move toward the development of a black studies program to understand that this is not just a proposal about the formal content of curriculum; it is not just a proposal to teach African history. It is a power move, and it is a proposal to redistribute power which seems previously, at least to some people, to have been unfairly distributed in the American society at large and in the college in particular.

The black studies movement is perhaps the only recent movement in colleges that I can identify as a really basic and significant innovation. If it finds roots, I believe we will see in consequence other student groups organizing in some innovative way to shift the distribution of power in the institution.

That is about all I want to say formally at this point. I will be happy to respond to questions, but I would be particularly interested in your opinions and more especially in generating a discussion between you who are new teachers and you who are administrators about some of these processes.

Discussion

Question: Will you explain the relationship between holding power and the redistribution of power, and what relationship there is to the traditional idea of the function of education?

Dr. Jones: Well, I can translate that some other ways. We have an idealization of a certain type of an individual. We are talking about some idealized reasonable person with critical capabilities and so on. It is actually a rather old educational ideal, the European educational ideal largely; it has an interesting and checkered history since the greatest portion of effort in American colleges and universities is not going into anything like that but instead to such areas as job

training. Such a vision of a well-educated person operates much more as a cover story than it does as a real established goal which sets priorities for institutional decision making. Many more decisions are made by the availability of federal grants than are made in the mind of some idealized rational person.

Comment: Faculty members do not have much decision-making power; therefore, they are not particularly qualified to teach the student how to make a decision. The best way to learn how to make a decision is by being tested under fire, or by redistributing the power which gives students the opportunity to learn how to make the kinds of decisions they will have to make. If they have to make these decisions within the university instead of having them made for them, they will go out and question the whole society instead of just working for business or industry. I do not see how we can train people in our liberal arts institutions and send them into corporations and claim we have educated them when they cannot make decisions. It seems to me that we have to teach them how to make decisions by offering them decision-making opportunities in college.

Comment: Up to the point of the students' committee on faculty firing and hiring like they did at the University of Paris! I think we can agree in substance with the assumption that comes with a student role of helping to decide, given what you want to do at the end of the course. What are you going to do with the student who, in fact, wants to work at Dow Chemical or IBM or to buy a house? He seems to be put down because he is already corrupted. Of course not.

The purpose of education is to stumble. You may stumble into techniques of letting students participate in the situation. You may stumble into expanding their minds so that they understand the nature of existence and its relationship to the social system. The student may become a rebel with or without a cause. Students will often do the kinds of things you do not want them to do. You cannot

predict how your students will turn out. There are many students who want to get out and get into the middle class—that is why many of them are going to college.

Comment: The student who works for Dow Chemical or who wants an expensive house in the suburbs has to make a critical choice. Universities are employment agencies. You go through them, and they make sure you are qualified, and they get you a job. That is all they are concerned with; that is all the students are concerned with.

If you look at it from society's view, society is not interested in turning out critics of its own foibles. We do not want confusion; we want order which does not change. Why not let students make decisions?

Dr. Jones: I defined significant innovation as a redistribution of power, and we seem to have focused on one particular kind of redistribution. Students want to redistribute power, and I think maybe the intersection between administration and faculty is a very critical one in this respect. I am not very confident about the educational consequences of shifting some of the powers to faculties that they are now demanding from administrations. One reason is that faculties have long since settled into a kind of masochistic pattern of inducing the administration to harass them. But then the faculty complains about it when the administration does come to them. Faculty members do not want to do administrative work. They also do not want to get caught in hard political binds which demean their elevated status. They imagine that they might be put in the position of discovering that there is no good answer in any of several alternative compromises; they would rather have somebody else responsible for making such decisions.

There must be a range of possibilities, some selectivity, and some thinking about what happens if you have certain kinds of redistribution of power in the institution. I think, for the most part college presidents often lack certain key powers which they ought to have, and in a certain way, I

think I am in favor of giving college presidents more power. I am also in favor of giving college students more power in certain ways. Again, I think you have to look at all these intersections and ask how this balance is going to be worked out.

Question: You said that students are responsible for the innovations that are made. And yet, you have said, in effect, that it is not the teachers who teach them to think critically. I am wondering who motivates the students to think critically and to want change, if not the teachers?

Dr. Jones: I am not sure that I agree that there is compatibility between thinking critically and wanting to change society. I think, more often than not, they represent mutually exclusive alternatives. It could be argued that the more critical analysis you get into, the less able you are to step out in an attempt to take significant social action. I do not think that because the student in the classroom learns to think critically and understands that things are wrong, he will then go out and do something about it. I just do not think it works that way.

Comment: Maybe I am making a mistake in thinking that most students agitate for change on campus nearer the end of the school year rather than at the beginning.

Dr. Jones: There is such a tendency. In fact, there are two humps in student agitation: one in late fall and another larger hump toward the spring. I think it would be interesting to know if that time phasing really has much to do with the faculty and with formal educational activities, or whether it really depends on other factors. My own feeling, based on some familiarity with a number of these kinds of crisis situations, is that the time phasing is mainly due to just how long it takes to get a group organized.

I can think of very little in general that most faculty members can do to change things on the college campus. As indicated before, everything (outside of what they do immediately in their classrooms) is subject to many other

checks and balances. It is not really within their domain to innovate. And if you have ever proposed a modestly changed program to a department of 30 fellow faculty members and watched them argue, you know what I mean.

Comment: Some of us may be aware, even before the year ends, that the basic problem between the students and the faculty may be due to a committee's structure and its inability to get together in order to do something about student requests. I think some of us already know that in many American colleges the students are directing their attention away from the administration and toward the actual origin of their problems.

Dr. Jones: I think that faculty have hidden behind the administration for a long time in dealing with student grievances. The most irrational authority in a college is the authority that a single faculty member in a classroom can exert over his students if he wants to. This is the least controlled and most potentially tyrannical exercise of authority in the entire institution. In many cases the teachers, through a faculty bureaucracy, prevent any action being taken about anything. In one new college I know about, the faculty has not yet made a significant decision on any topic; but its bureaucracy is beautifully oiled and ready to go. And the students are just now catching on to what the faculty has been doing. Instead of dealing with the issues that the students are concerned with, it has been forming committees, which should be an adequate preventative against any significant innovation, I would think.

Question: You assign certain authority to the administration. When it gives up some of the authority to the faculty or to the students, can you define the problems of the administration?

Dr. Jones: I guess I am not as optimistic as you are about people who have power giving it away.

Comment: I think you are right that power is not given away. You have to somehow create a situation where you

shift it.

Comment: A very wise administrator told me once that you have a lot of power until you use it. I cannot help but be somewhat unsettled by this discussion. I am reminded of a national survey of student protests done in 1966. It was found that the most frequently protested issues had to do with the off-campus issues of civil rights and Vietnam. The third most protested issue was food services. Perhaps we have to achieve significant innovation toward the redistribution of power; perhaps the student is the one who is really concerned. But the key to this is what the student thinks about the faculty member. Faculty are beginning to get through to students, and we find that the issues they protest that we agree with are those protested by the brighter students. This has been a finding in almost every study. Behind each protest action there also seems to be some faculty people. But still I am troubled because this does little more than say, "Let us get in and join them and push for those things that we believe in; let's support them when they take up our voice." What about curricular innovation? What about those problems which are associated with adherence to a discipline? What are the characteristics of an administration that will permit me as a teacher to think freely, to try out the experiment?

Comment: We think the administration has a lot of power. But I can see situations where the administrators do not have the answer and they shift the blame to teachers. If teachers do not have the answers, they shift the blame to the administrators.

Comment: I think we need to give serious consideration to the redistribution of power. What responsibilities do we need to assume with reference to this? Are we serious about redistributing power?

In an institution with which I was connected a few years ago, when the idea of giving students more voice came up,

several faculty said, yes, they should have more voice. But as soon as the same faculty members found out that the students also wanted to have a voice in their promotions, they felt that this was a faculty and administrative concern and that the students should not have anything to do with it. So in my judgment, they were really concerned about giving the students the power they wanted the students to have, rather than working with the students and coming up with some kind of agreement as to what power the students should have, what power the faculty should have compared with what power the administration would have. I think there is confusion because we are not quite sure what we want to do about the redistribution of power.

Dr. Jones: An issue was raised earlier about strategies that can be used to blunt protests in college. I think the example just given is a very good one. In many places where the faculty has expressed great altruism in regard to seeing students move into decision-making, it has later become clear that faculty members were not quite that serious about it to begin with.

It is a rather old story for faculty members to go to administrators, who often lack the power to grant them what they want anyhow, but who are delighted to appoint them to a committee and make them chairman of the working group. There are a lot of strategies of this kind to blunt action and to divert it. Many institutions operate that way.

I am reminded of some historical facts that we tend to forget. First of all, when universities were first established in Europe the students had the power to hire and fire the faculty; that is how universities got started. We have come a long way since then. It is also important to remember that universities were originally training places for the priesthood, because I think there are many things about a modern university that you cannot possibly understand unless you remember that it has carried over many features that go back to that origin. Now it has become commonplace that there is

such a thing as religious concern; sometimes the church exemplifies it and sometimes it does not. Religious institutions historically have often gone through major reforms to get them back into religious concerns and away from the things they have become involved in.

Colleges and universities go through the same cycle, and it seems to me that they frequently find themselves doing things that are not really related to education at all. At such a point, as is the case with the church and religion, a massive reform results in relating them back to the educational process. If they fail to do it, education will simply start going on in other types of institutions.

I think that we are now entering a period in which it is being suggested that colleges and universities do not have anything to do with education, and that the student who is serious about his education might think about going elsewhere. This is what I meant when I said that most forms of the curriculum do not matter one way or the other. I think that most forms of curriculum design and planning do not relate closely to the actual educational process that results from it. If it does relate, it relates for six months or a year, and then it does not relate any more.

Comment: You mentioned only half of the historical background when you were talking about the University of Paris. You must also remember the University of London, which was completely dominated by the professors. I agree that much of our present curriculum is ineffective and irrelevant. But in educational innovation, I believe that the power lies with the faculty.

Let me take perhaps one of the more controversial examples. What is the role of the white faculty member in a school with a predominantly or completely black student body? And I think that when you ask that question and begin to address it, you will come into an area of the kind I was thinking of. Is it possible, or does it make any sense, to have white faculty members teach in black colleges?

Comment: I wonder if some of the faculty members, particularly those who might not be so young, would talk about this because some of the new teachers have this exact problem. Very often they are excited about something that might be innovative and most worthwhile to the college, yet it may threaten another faculty member. Someone here has said that a number of potentially good ideas and improved practices get nowhere. When the question is raised as to why, the administration blames the faculty, and the faculty blames the administration. I wonder if someone would talk about this as it relates to the teacher who is often caught between these groups as they pass the buck.

Comment: This is something that continues to trouble me since I am not so sure that it is the redistribution of power that is helping each of the members of the establishment, i.e., the students, the faculty, the administration and the trustees, make effective use of the power they have. Neither am I sure that all good ends are achieved by protest or by fighting or by opposing. There are some things, of course, that come to such a situation that students or faculty or perhaps administrators should indeed rise up and take very significant stands. The other thing that bothers me is that I am not sure that all innovation, simply because it is innovation, is good. Some of these things that fail, fail because they ought to fail.

With those thoughts in mind, let me propose this. I think the best way to achieve innovation or to contribute to the continued building of an effective education situation is for each person, especially the faculty member and the administrator, to consider himself responsible not only for those people who "report to him" or face accordingly when he talks, but also responsible for those to whom he talks. If I am a faculty member and concerned about something and I see a barrier in the way, I can see two possibilities: I can attack, I can incite my students. That is pretty easy as they are very malleable. They do listen, particularly if you are

upset about something. On the other hand, I can consider myself responsible for the care, feeding, and instruction of my dean and president, and through them, my trustees. Now how do I carry this off? First I am concerned primarily about my teaching responsibility, and I can let that be the guiding value.

Comment: It seems that what we are really talking about is, in fact, the new versus the old, the unestablished versus those who are established. We are talking about institutional loyalty. The real question for the young teacher may be how long do you plan to be there. People will tend to permit certain kinds of changes to occur with people they feel are loyal to what the institution is trying to do. If the faculty member is really going to stay around, then he has another way by which he can deal with all of his obstacles, and he will know where the power sources are and how to make his moves. We are also talking about the phenomenon of transiency versus permanence and stability. That is the source of many of the problems faced by the new college teacher.

Comment: I think the eloquence of many of these statements, and I believe I speak for all who are present, underscores the soundness of Dr. Jones' decision to provide for discussion rather than to present a formal paper. We are very much indebted to him for setting a framework in which this discussion could take place.

Reflections of the Administrator

GENERAL AIMS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COLLEGE

Samuel D. Proctor

I want to focus my thought on the general aims of the college. I think that the president and trustees should stop every once in a while and ask themselves what they are presiding over and what the end product should look like.

The young college teacher should be aware of the fact that most all colleges have obvious and formal power structures and informal ones. Major decisions are often made through unofficial as well as official channels, involving on-campus educators, leaders in the state, regional and national educational organizations, alumni, and others. The young teacher should be aware that this kind of unseen administration is an important force in higher education today.

There are institutions that are highly influenced by their alumni. These schools have what I call a heavy dose of "alma mater-iology." Among black institutions, Morehouse College is an example of this phenomenon. Ph.D. statistics also play a part in alma mater-iology—i.e., the number of alumni who have gone on to complete their doctorates. This becomes a matter of great competition among institutions.

All I am saying is that any consideration of changes or innovations in colleges and universities must take into account the influence of alumni and other power bases, both on campus and off-campus. I am not necessarily talking about someone who has money and gives it to a college. I am talking about those who have a sense of destiny about an institution, who know enough people to have an impact on the moves that are made on campus. In some public colleges it may be someone who is close to the appropriations committee in the legislature. If the president wants to make a

move, he is wise to find out what such a person thinks about it, because the needed appropriation is not likely to be forthcoming without his endorsement. This may be a cynical view of things, but if you want to get everything on the table, you may as well start here.

Preparing Students for Employment

I think you have three choices about what a college is going to be and do. You have already mentioned one of them in prior discussion; that is, it is a kind of career production center. We can deal with this quickly in talking about the white majority, because it may not be as important for a white person who is intelligent to find a niche without his credentializing what the college has done for him. Credentials are more crucial for a black student—man or woman. The correlation between years of schooling and degrees earned and income will affect the black person a great deal more than it will one who is white. The whole business community is not as open to a black person who is non-credentialized as it is to a white person.

I raise questions about students who are left of center, who are in black student communities, who have a revolutionary thrust, and who try to talk other students out of the pursuit of middle-class standards in American life. Middle class is a fuzzy term. If one is talking about snobbishness, carelessness, indifference, egocentricity, these apply to other classes as well as the middle class. But if you are talking about people being away from the rim of destitution, people having an annual salary that keeps children healthy and that provides recreational opportunities, I am all for black people having that. If you choose to call them middle class when they get there, that is quite all right with me.

I am very suspicious of youngsters, especially white, who enter the university and put on dungarees and sandals, but who, at any moment, can revert to the ivy togs and the

striped ties. They get home, and everything can be ordered and deliberate; they can make their transition far too quickly. The black student, however, runs a heavy risk in forsaking the career direction in which a college points him.

I think that the black colleges and the white institutions that have black students ought to be very careful not to overlook the fact that economic problems that black people face are critical. We in black communities do not have yet the kind of economic base which affords the luxury of having people spend four years in college and then graduate without some kind of definite career direction. We want people to be free, to be able to do what they want to do. But if it comes down to the option of being employed or not being employed, we would like for them to have employment as a very real option and not some kind of mirage.

I have watched personnel development, and I know for a fact that colleges are the happiest hunting ground that industries and businesses could ever find. Some of the techniques used in placement are fantastic. Big businesses throughout the country have practically everybody computerized who is fit to be hired. This is a highly-developed system. Far more automated are they, in terms of the employment of college graduates, than we think. And the skill with which they operate would amaze you. When I saw them go through the motions of telling black colleges how to conduct interviews and how to prepare students for interviews it struck me that the business community regards the college community as its production ground. When you consider what most students go to college for, there is harmony and consonance there. There is no real contradiction between what the businesses are expecting and what parents are looking for in terms of their investment.

There is one additional little twist here that I think merits attention. That is the area of teacher education. Though colleges may assist business and industry by serving as employment agencies, school systems have *no other* place

to turn but to the colleges for the education of teachers. There seems to be little excuse for us not doing something quite different with teacher production than we have been doing. We are more in control of that market than we realize. We have much more to say about what kind of teacher hits the classroom than the superintendent who is receiving the teacher, or the accrediting agency of a state. If we can get teachers to recognize their crucial role in terms of defining values, in terms of social change, in terms of social direction, we would do this country a lot of good. As it happens, a large percentage of graduates in all of our institutions end up in the teaching profession, even though in many cases only for a short time. I think the way the colleges have acted, as if they really have very few options in this area, is a sad thing.

I heard a girl from one of the colleges in Virginia say that their teacher education department did not encourage or permit them to do practice teaching in black schools or integrated schools. So the churches in that town got together and bought a house and named it the Kumbaya House; and in that house, these white students meet black pupils from the ghetto—the ones they wanted to tutor. This girl reported, at one of our testing conferences on school integration, that had she only followed the teacher education program at her college, she would never have had the nerve to go into a classroom of black students. But after having tutored in the Kumbaya House, she felt she could go anywhere and teach black children how to read.

Even though we are job producers and a kind of happy hunting ground for other employers, we certainly ought to take advantage of the opportunities we have to change what happens in the public schools. And if you can change what is happening in the public schools, you can change the whole society.

Preparing Students for Our Culture

The second thing that the colleges can be, and have

been, is a kind of conduit for western civilization—the conduit through which the culture of Christendom has come to us.

Colleges must also prepare people to live in their culture, and this is one of our big problems today. Students are saying that all they are getting now is a rehearsal of how to take their fathers' places in the suburbs. I do not know what we can really do about this today. Other problems are involved which are really theological. I am referring to Adam biting the apple and who has advantages that he is ready to surrender for a known disadvantage or for a shared advantage.

Students often revert to status quo complacency not because this is required by society, but because the advantages are there and because the ego finds comfort there. The girl a young man wants to marry may require him to revert "to type"; the family of which he wants to be a part may also expect it. This may have little to do with what the college experience has meant to him, but the college shares the same pressures that the student feels.

College As Community of Learners

The third thing that a college can be is a center for the cultivation of learning. And I take it, from the discussion I have heard here, that this is what most people in this room would want and expect a college to be. I think there have been some very innovative things done. In one of the institutions in the Thirteen Colleges Project, I looked at the bookstore before the Project began. It consisted of about eight shelves of paperbacks. Now they have had to expand, because the reading students are doing in the Project has caused the freshmen to want to read different kinds of things. More than that, the teachers themselves confessed to me that when they had to throw away the freshman textbooks and rewrite the curriculum, they learned more in the process than they learned in all the graduate studies they

had had. They put more pressure on the students and the students responded.

I am sure you have heard about the program with Mexican students in San Francisco. Some professors put 20 students in a class with a teacher and told her they all had high academic potential, excellent IQ's and that she should make them work. In reality, they had the lowest IQ's in the entire mix. In another class, where they really had the high IQ's, the teacher was told that they were ordinary students. What happened? Where the instructors had been told that their students had the highest IQ's, the students made the most rapid progress. Where the instructors thought they had only average students, the students made the least progress. It is clear that we have not exhausted the possibility for innovation. Nor have we exhausted the possibility of expecting more of our students.

Reflections of the Administrator

POLICY AND DECISION MAKING

Dale V. Ulrich

Institutional policy formulation and decision making are undergoing an exciting revolution in our time. No longer is it possible for a president to run even a small college out of his hip pocket, so to speak, or to understand the forces at work on his campus by simply being part of the scene. Rather, policy and decisions are finding their base in analyzed institutional data. The present excitement in the field of policy and decision making results from the development of, and the tremendous importance being given to, institutional research in higher education.

Colleges and universities have promoted scholarly research through the decades, but not until recent times have they turned their research skills inward upon themselves to bring about more adequate self-understanding and self-improvement. To be sure, individuals here and there have gathered institutional data for many years. But institutional research was not recognized as an important administrative function until after World War II, when institutions had to deal with rapidly expanding enrollments. Before 1955, only 10 institutions had offices of institutional research; by 1964, 115 institutions had either a bureau or a person specifically given the responsibility of performing institutional research. For a variety of reasons, larger institutions have tended to develop offices of institutional research earlier than small colleges, but notable institutional research has also been done in a few smaller institutions.

Henry S. Dyer has pointed out that, while institutional research has now established its identity and is at home in higher education administration, it has yet to establish a uniform direction. The approaches to institutional research

are as varied as the institutions they serve. At one extreme, an institutional research office is quite independent of institutional directives and concerns itself with sociopsychological research primarily on students. At the other extreme, an office of institutional research is closely tied to the office of the president and concerns itself only with studies relating to economy and efficiency of institutional operation. Dyer suggests that eventually, when greater sophistication is possessed, a science of institutions will emerge. It will be a true science in that generalizations or hypotheses will be developed which can be tested by further studies.

Computers are giving institutional research a tremendous boost. Initially these instruments have had wide use in student services, accounting, budget building, grade reporting, alumni records, etc. Now, the avant-garde use of the computer is to simulate a complete university. Once a mathematical model of the university is developed, the computer can be used to project years into the future. Such projections are based upon certain assumptions concerning enrollment, tuition, faculty salaries, income from endowment, and so on. Recognizing the value of this approach, a few major universities are working very hard to perfect computer simulation models. Indeed, computer simulation holds for the future important implications for institutional policy formulation and long-range planning.

With that brief introduction to the dependence of policy formulation and decision making upon institutional research, I would like to share some personal experiences and give two examples of how institutional research is affecting policy at Bridgewater College (Virginia).

Pilot Program in Institutional Research

In the summer of 1967, the Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia (RELCV) began a

pilot program of assisting 20 colleges and universities in establishing a program of institutional research on each of the campuses. Representatives from these institutions met initially for a three-week workshop to receive introductory training. Subsequently, two short workshops were held for further encouragement, study and sharing together by representatives of the participating institutions.

At the initial summer workshop, the participants were exposed to the methodology of "nuts-and-bolts" institutional research projects, that is, space utilization, budget building, and the like; and they were introduced to instruments for ascertaining student characteristics and attitudes. We participants were impressed with the state of the art in the area of measuring academic "input" and "output." We were equally impressed with the need for greater knowledge and experimentation in the area of academic process or "throughput," as one of the participants coined it.

The outstanding instrument presented at the first workshop was *College Student Questionnaires, Part I and Part II,* published by Educational Testing Service. Part I is designed for administration to new students soon after their arrival on the campus, while Part II is to be answered by students after they experience the college scene. Each of these instruments contains 200 items designed to provide background and attitudinal information on student groups.

It was my pleasure to represent Bridgewater College at the initial and subsequent workshops conducted by RELCV and to work toward extending institutional research activities on the Bridgewater campus.

Bridgewater College is related to a small protestant denomination, the Church of the Brethren. The college is growing and attracting students from an ever-expanding geographical area with a concomitant decline in the percentage of students from the supporting denomination. The question most raised by interested persons as they reflect upon the changing background of the student body is, "What

is to be the effect of the more cosmopolitan student composition upon the character of the college?"

Last weekend, the Board of Trustees approved a matching grant program whereby the college proposes to match scholarships granted to students by local congregations of the sponsoring denomination in amounts of $100 per semester. The first example of the impact of institutional research on college decision making is a discussion of the background leading to this decision by the Board. Four years ago, President Geisert informally suggested that such a cooperative scholarship program would be helpful, but the idea did not catch on. Maybe the staff only needed time to consider the matter, but more likely, institutional research played a significant role in showing that these students are important to the kind of college Bridgewater would like to be.

College Student Questionnaire (CSQ), Parts I and II, were employed last year in a study of background and attitudes of students on the Bridgewater campus. From CSQ-I items, the following scales were developed: Motivation for Grades, Family Social Status, Family Independence, Peer Independence, Liberalism, Social Conscience, and Cultural Sophistication. The results revealed Brethren students to be significantly more liberal and higher in social conscience than those from other backgrounds. CSQ-II items give rise to all but the first two of the scales found in CSQ-I plus: Satisfaction with Faculty, Satisfaction with Administration, Satisfaction with Major, Satisfaction with Students, Study Habits, and Extracurricular Involvement. From this questionnaire, it was learned that, on the average, students with backgrounds in the supporting denomination were more satisfied with the faculty and administration, and they continued to be more liberal and maintain a higher social conscience than students from other backgrounds. From these studies it was concluded that Brethren students do make a difference in the total student culture and that they

influence it in the desired direction.

An item from CSQ-I pointed to a most important factor in the enrollment of these students. This item revealed that 45 percent of the Brethren students estimated their family incomes to be less than $8,000, while only 25 percent of students from other backgrounds estimated their family incomes to be in the same range. With this financial data and the information revealed on attitudes, the faculty, staff, and trustees were ready to adopt a matching scholarship program with Churches of the Brethren. This decision represents a definite shift in policy which has grown out of institutional research. Furthermore, it seems to be a reasonable procedure in view of the fact that local congregations will continue to underwrite the annual operating budget in an amount which exceeds the cost of this program.

Experimental Institutional Research

As a second example of institutional research which may have far-reaching implications for future decisions to be made at our college, and possibly yours, I want to mention an experiment under way this semester in the psychology department. The general psychology class has been divided into two parts, a control group and an experimental group. While the control group receives lectures and tests in the same manner as in previous years, the experimental group hears no lectures. Instead, each student in the experimental group studies units of material at his own pace. Upon completion of a unit, he takes a readiness test to determine whether or not he has mastered the unit and is ready to proceed to the next. The readiness tests are marked immediately by the professor and discussed with the student. For comparison purposes, the control group and the experimental group take the same examinations. While it is too early to predict the outcome of this experiment, it appears that the experimental group will probably perform

better than the control group, even though the experimental group has heard no lectures.

An attitudinal measuring instrument to detect changes in attitude toward such matters as mental illness is also being administered. Through this experiment, the following hypothesis is being tested: Lecturing is a poor way to transmit knowledge, but professors, through lectures, do affect attitudes. If this experiment on educational process provides significant results, it will have profound implications for teaching methods in many departments and on many educational policies.

Future Applications of Institutional Research

Bridgewater has tried to develop its institutional research effort in such a way that maximum coverage can be given to different types of research studies. This fall an institutional research committee has been established with membership composed of the assistant to the president, a psychology professor, the director of the computing center, and the dean of the college. Believing that educational policy and decisions properly grow from roots firmly grounded in research, this group proposes to do both nuts-and-bolts and socio-psychological research, to study input, output, and throughput.

Consider the groups comprising a college or university: The students have power. Along with their parents, they are buying the college's services. Because students are the most numerous, they can disrupt and even stop campus operations. Furthermore, satisfied students are the most effective recruiters of new students. The faculty has power. Its members are operating in a seller's market and can leave, or they have tenure and cannot be fired. The president has power. He controls hiring, the budget, and appointed offices. He reports to the Board of Trustees on behalf of the college and back to the college from the Board of Trustees. The

Board of Trustees has power, given to it legally in the Charter. Furthermore, it hires the president, and since he has no tenure, it can also fire him. Alumni have power. Besides being a source of needed income, the image of the college is largely dependent upon them. With such strong and diverse forces affecting a university, it is exceedingly important that policy and decisions be made from a firm data base achieved through sound institutional research.

The fastest growing fields of academic knowledge are those employing extensive research. Likewise, those businesses which are most viable and have the greatest longevity are investing vast sums in market research and product improvement. Colleges and universities must likewise research their own operations and products if their policy formulation and decision making are to yield utmost effectiveness for the institution and maximum profit to the society they serve.

Reflections of
the Administrator

PARTICIPATION OF NEW FACULTY IN THE TOTAL COLLEGE PROGRAM

Mereb E. Mossman

I understand that most of you have come to your institutions immediately from graduate schools with the recent findings of your particular fields at your fingertips. You are familiar with the concerns of students, having just been one yourself. And you may still be under the magic age of 30, which it is said makes it easy for students to communicate with you. You have probably come to college teaching with the hope that, in the duties you are taking on, you will be able to continue to discover more about the kind of professional self into which you hope to develop. You do not have such vested interests in the past that you are afraid to formulate and deal with the questions that men must ask themselves in our world today. These combined qualities may enable you to look with a fresh perspective upon your institution and thus enable you to add new dimensions.

Educational Mission of the College or University

As we talk about a college program, we must remind ourselves that the program of any given institution is related to the educational mission of that institution. There are many kinds of institutions of higher education: two-year community and junior colleges, four-year liberal arts colleges, technical institutions, special-purpose professional institutions, universities made up of a wide variety of colleges and schools. Some are for superior students, some for average; some for men, some for women, some are coeducational; some are predominantly Negro, some predominantly white; some are tax supported, some privately

supported, and some have varying combinations of these sources of support. Some serve as intellectual centers and push forward those things which men know; others are concerned primarily in transmitting to students that which is already known so that they may make use of knowledge both for their benefit and that of society. But regardless of any other characteristics an institution may have, if it is to play a role with meaning it must identify its purposes and then move toward the goals that these purposes impose. An institution that does not know where it is going reminds one of a conversation between Alice and the cat in *Alice in Wonderland:*

> "Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?" Alice said.
>
> "That depends a good deal on where you want to get to," said the cat.
>
> "I don't much care where," said Alice.
>
> "Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the cat.
>
> "So long as I get *somewhere*," Alice added.
>
> "Oh, you're sure to do that," said the cat, "if you only walk long enough."

Institutions that do not know where they want to go can too easily find that if they "just walk long enough" they will add some students, some courses, some faculty, some buildings and never achieve much except to continue to add. You probably have noticed that there is a tendency for two-year colleges to want to grow into four-year institutions; for single-purpose professional institutions to want to become colleges; for four-year colleges to want to become universities; and for universities to want to add more and more professional schools, degrees, institutes, centers, experimental colleges, honors colleges, etc. And in the general rush to beome more and more things to more and more people, there is danger that an institution does not stop long enough to try and discover what is at the heart and center of its institutional being. And you as faculty cannot

participate effectively in the total academic program of a college if that college does not know what it is primarily about.

I believe that an institution that has tried to define its educational mission knows several kinds of things about itself:

It knows who the students are that the college wishes to serve and something of their characteristics, qualifications, and backgrounds. It knows what kinds of family, ethnic, and economic backgrounds the students have, what aspirations, what quality of secondary education, and what the economic and social characteristics are of the geographical areas from which they come.

It knows something about the fields of knowledge into which it seeks to move and how it hopes to develop these in order to meet the needs of the students it seeks to serve. This may lead to "the land grant idea," or "the broad liberal arts conception," or a vocational and technical orientation, or some combination of these as dominant curricular notions. In the case of a college serving primarily a single ethnic group, there may be some emphasis upon that group's heritage—thus introducing a focus which gives cultural stress to their history, art, music, and literature. Catholic institutions used this approach at one time. Predominantly black institutions are currently examining some aspects of this approach as one way in which to enrich curriculum and give students a sense of their past in relation to their present.

It knows that faculty must be recruited in relation to these educational objectives. For example, a

man who wishes primarily to do research is not most effective in an institution that is essentially interested in a teaching faculty. A man with highly specialized professional interests may not find satisfactions in a small college in which his teaching load must cover broad areas. The man interested only in teaching bright students with excellent backgrounds will be ineffective in the school that draws largely students with poor backgrounds who need remedial work.

It knows that the priorities in development of the library, laboratories, and classrooms must emerge as a result of the formulation of educational purposes. Residence halls and athletic programs should be developed only if they have identified functions to fulfill in the overall educational goals.

It knows something of its place in the life of the community and world of which it is a part.

Once an institution has examined some of the dimensions within which it seeks to work, then it is in a position to take hold and set for itself the task of achieving its purposes with excellence. The issues that arise, the selection of new faculty, and the capital investments to be made can be looked at in the light of what it seeks to accomplish.

Roles of Individual Faculty Members

You have already found that, as faculty members, you have dual roles that you are expected to fulfill in the college program. One role is that of the professional with an area of specialization—you are a sociologist, or a physicist, or a chemist, or a historian. The other role is that of membership in a larger company of teacher-scholars—the faculty of the

institution. As a professional with a specialty, you are an individual who in the institution finds your place within a department. As a general faculty member, you have collegial duties and opportunities that are related to the total college.

Let us look first at you as a professional in the institution. The new instructor finds that, as a member of a department, he is inducted quickly into the expectations of the institution concerning his duties—he has a given number of classes, he teaches, grades papers, works with the students—and then compares notes with associates about the performance of these tasks. (You have reflected earlier today on teaching expectations and realities, but I should like to comment that college teaching is one profession for which we still fail to prepare the practitioner for the specific tasks he is to perform on the teaching faculty; and, in consequence, many of us flounder around and, through trial and error, find what we hope are our strengths in instruction.)

There is another aspect of the role of the faculty professional—the scholarly or creative part of him. He knows in a less clearly stated but implied way that this is also a part of the college's expectations of him as a faculty member. It is the learning portion of him which he shares not only with students but with his peers. It involves attendance and participation in professional meetings, giving papers before his colleagues, and submitting papers for publication. The model of his professors in graduate school often serves as the image that casts a shadow and leaves him with feelings of dissatisfaction if this part of him does not have an opportunity to continue to develop. He becomes troubled and may feel he is failing when he hears that several of his fellow students in graduate school have finished their dissertations; one man has had his accepted by a university press for publication; another has been asked to read a paper at a national meeting; another is serving as a consultant under a Title I grant; one has gotten an NIH grant; another, an NSF grant. Grants, publications, consultantships, participation at

regional and national meetings—these provide the visible bases that make faculty professionally mobile and sought after. They are the easily recognized signs of scholarly success. A college president in a predominantly Negro institution recently said, "I almost hate to have one of my strong faculty members publish, for it is a sure way for a dozen institutions to try to lure him away." This aspect of professionalization is closely related to marketability. The key to new opportunities is often by the narrow route of publication. Someone has said, "A good teaching reputation, like some wines, does not travel well, but publications are highly portable."

In the undergraduate college, I believe that it is not of primary importance that a man be pressed to do research and publish. However, I think that it is a matter of the greatest concern that faculty members have an opportunity to continue to learn. Teaching and learning are complementary. It is the responsibility of the institution to work at creating and perpetuating an atmosphere in which a faculty member can find the time and the resources to keep up in his particular field.

Collegial Duties of the Faculty

Let us now turn from looking at the individual faculty member as a professional to his broader participation in the general educational affairs of the institution. One's collegial duties are sometimes not as clearly defined and realized as are those that are departmental and professional, but they are equally important. A college is more than a collection of departments and schools, and it is more than a number of faculty, students, administrators, and trustees. It is a complex social organization in which each of these constituent parts has important duties to perform in the governance of the college.

The faculty is normally and properly the deliberative

body vested with major responsibility for initiating and acting upon matters related to curriculum, instruction, major programs, admission and general degree requirements, major and degree programs; it is also responsible for such matters as the development of institutional policies related to faculty appointments, tenure, promotion, and academic freedom, these policies subject to endorsement by the president of the institution and the trustees. It is the task of the administration and the faculty to establish an organization that will enable the faculty to fulfill these duties. (May I say parenthetically that many institutions are looking toward new institutional mechanisms that will enable students to exert more influence in the educational program.) The academic strengths of the college will be determined by the ways in which the faculty views these tasks. If the faculty is imaginative, innovative, and interested in change as well as continuity, the academic life of the college will be lively and vigorous. If it is apathetic and disinterested and individuals are professionally self-centered, academic affairs will not keep pace with the changing world today. As a check on yourself, what do you say when a colleague comes up with a new idea that suggests change? The response could be, "Let's think about it. It sounds interesting," Or, it might be, "That's not the way we do it here."

It lies in the hands of the faculty to move into new academic frontiers—there can be experiments in honors study, area and international studies, field studies which relate the classroom and the community, new arrangements for degree requirements, new patterns for the academic calendar, innovations in instruction, experiments with variations in admissions requirements, grading practices, and class attendance regulations.

Each faculty member must bear some share of the responsibility for the regular ongoing study of the various aspects of the academic life of his institution. He must not be satisfied to accept last year's admissions standards until he

has discovered their relation to the college performance of the students admitted. He must not accept current general degree requirements until he tries to discover whether they achieve identified goals. He must not be satisfied with instructional methods until he has tried out new technological aids. He must not be satisfied with academic programs that do not speak to important issues in our world today. Every aspect of academic life should be kept under the microscope for constant review to see that we do not sit by the side of the road in a world that is moving.

The faculty member who undertakes his collegial duties as a part of his assignment is seeing beyond the personal, professional satisfactions of a specialized field of learning to the broader perspective of more effectively serving students and the society of which the college is a part.

Address

THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT AS TEACHER

Mervin B. Freedman

I teach at San Francisco State College. Along with several dozen faculty members and students, I stand at a fifth-floor window and watch a noontime rally of strikers and their supporters. After an hour or so of speeches, the crowd displays a certain agitation. Police begin to appear on the scene. They march and countermarch in squads and platoons. Eventually skirmishing and some open fighting develop. Several dozen strikers and bystanders are clubbed and hauled off in paddy wagons. Some policemen are injured, mostly by rocks and other missiles. The warfare lasts for about an hour. An uneasy calm then settles on the campus, and at noon the next day almost the same scene is repeated, like a regularly scheduled public spectacle.

As I watch these terrifying events, various images come to mind—the Hapsburgs or Romanovs looking down from the palace windows through the snows of Vienna and St. Petersburg at the cavalry clashing with students and workers. From time to time the military quality of the scene below suggests that I have assumed the vantage point of some 19th century general, Napoleon at Austerlitz, perhaps, surveying a battle from a hill through a spyglass. Since I was raised in Ocean Hill in Brooklyn and served in World War II for three and one-half years as an enlisted man before I was commissioned a second lieutenant, identifications with emperors and generals are not particularly congenial. The most apposite image to come to mind is Oswald Spengler's—the Roman soldier grimly going about his business (in my case teaching my classes off-campus) while his world crumbles. But I am not a very good Roman soldier,

either. I have too many doubts. So I go about in a whirl, torn by contradictory impulses.

Reasons for Disorder

The situation at San Francisco State College baffles description and analysis. The Black Students Union and the Third World Liberation Front (composed of other minorities; for example, Orientals and Mexican-Americans) have called for a strike. Their demands, centered on more support and autonomy for black and other nonwhite students, faculty, and programs, range from stipulations that most students, administrators, and faculty consider reasonable to those that seem extreme and very difficult to meet—the demand, for example, that the college admit *all* nonwhite students who apply for the fall semester of 1969-70. Spokesmen for the Black Students Union and the Third World Liberation Front state that they will not compromise their demands. Certain activities disruptive of academic procedures have been carried out. Classrooms have been invaded, bomb threats have been phoned in, small explosive devices have been set off, fires have been started, and so forth. Serious injuries have been few and damage relatively slight, but it is certain that the climate is troubled and alarmed. Many classes now meet off-campus in dormitories, homes, churches, and the like. A union of faculty members, an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers, is attempting to obtain wider union support for a faculty strike. The split between faculty members and the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges has been growing for a long time; now one of the faculty demands is that the trustees, who have been as adamant as the striking students in their refusal to negotiate, enter into discussion with strikers, both faculty and student.

Is There a Solution?

At dinner parties I am harassed by the question, "What is the solution?" By now I have a reply ready. There is, I say,

no solution in the present focus. The problem of San Francisco State College is the problem of all urban campuses, and it is the basic problem of American urban society generally. Can whites, blacks, browns, reds, yellows, adults, youth, hippies, straights, revolutionaries, conservatives live together in sufficient harmony to maintain some orderly processes of society? The answer is not yet final, but the data at hand are not encouraging. Some years back I used to make predictions about complex social events, but I lack such confidence now. I offer three alternatives:

(1) The disorders on campuses are but transitory phenomena which will end soon.

(2) During the next decade, the San Francisco State situation will become the norm for urban college campuses and for cities generally. Disorder, explosions, fires, guerrilla warfare, strikes will be common events. At the end of this time a more just, humane, and peaceable society will emerge.

(3) Out of recurrent tension and disorder will issue a Fascist state. College campuses and society generally will increasingly resemble South Africa.

The problems of San Francisco State are basically the problems of any urban campus, and the future of American higher education is increasingly the large, urban, commuter campus. No simple procedures are available for avoiding repetitions of the calamities at San Francisco State all over the country. The close interplay now seen in every big city between society at large and the urban campus is evident in the San Francisco State scene. The governor of California, the mayor of San Francisco, various state assemblymen and senators, clergymen, leaders of the black, Oriental and Mexican-American communities, and the San Francisco Labor Council have all entered the fight. Von Clausewitz's dictum may be applied to the student strike—it is simply a more militant form of political action.

Stormy Sailing for Urban College President

The urban campus reflects the conflicts of urban society—nonwhite or non-Anglo militancy, alienated middle-class youth, repressive public opinion and public officials, heavy-handed police procedures, drugs, and the like. And as with society at large the system of academic government is not adequate to the task. Jeffersonian-style democracy and checks and balances cannot cope with the pace and the complexity of mass technological society. The traditional campus community also belongs to another age, the 19th century. In static times a system can carry an inadequate leader. When traditional procedures break down, the qualities of the leader assume crucial importance. The president of an urban college must grasp, make evident, and somehow cope with a bewildering variety of issues, for many or for most of which there are no precedents. He is thus sailing stormy and uncharted waters.

The president of an urban campus must attempt to fashion a viable institution out of a student body that is a very mixed bag. The interests of student groups are diverse and often conflicting—jocks versus radicals, upper-middle-class students with educational goals centered on personal development versus lower-middle-class students who are concerned with rising out of their parents' occupational status, minority groups versus more established groups, and sometimes one minority group against another. The governing of most private universities and colleges, where the student body is relatively homogeneous, is a far easier task.

The Fragmented Constituency

The traditional concept of a campus community is based on the premise that people know one another and share many experiences and concerns. On a fragmented, urban, commuter campus this is hardly the case. The

president frequently finds himself discussing an explosive issue with a group of students whom he has not met before. For all he knows, some of these young people may not be students. Should an ex-student be considered a member of the campus community? How about a resident of the local community who has never been enrolled in the college? Should the president refuse to talk to a young man or woman if it develops that he or she is an "outside agitator?"

Needless to say, public opinion is a force with which college presidents must reckon. It may seem ludicrous to suggest that college presidents must educate public officials and citizens at large on the basic issues of intellectual and academic freedom. But they must nevertheless try.

Students and trustees, legislators, and public opinion are by no means the limit of the president's concern. When a campus is in turmoil, one hears comparatively little about the faculty. This is a serious oversight, as any president knows. A faculty can immobilize a campus as effectively as any other group. One hundred students can bring in the police and cancel classes. Fifteen faculty members can block almost any program by talking it to death.

For the past nine months, I have been studying faculty attitudes toward student militancy and campus unrest. It may be said that faculty members are like other Americans at this time. They are somewhat demoralized, weary of conflict, and they are shifting perceptibly to the right in the face of radical challenge. Most campuses have a small group of faculty whose views resemble Hearst editorials circa 1938 and another minority which supports student dissidents. The majority of faculty members on an urban campus are liberals. Robert Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy were their candidates. They want a fast compromise solution to Vietnam. They want justice along with law and order. But at the gut level of daily action, things are not so easy. Respectable professional men bristle when confronted by obscene language, outlandish dress, and bad manners. Black

militants may frighten them. Differences in personal style can obscure areas of agreement and avenues of potentially profitable exploration.

Faculty members are lords of small empires and masters of orderly schedules. A teacher meets classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, researches and writes on Tuesday and Thursday. Forty-two lectures on the United States, 1865-1914, are to be delivered in the spring semester. The symphony orchestra will give a concert on December 1, 2, 3, and the drama department's performance of *Heartbreak House* takes place on November 10 and 11. Interruptions are resented. One faculty member said to me: "If the college wants to schedule a convocation on Vietnam, let them do it nights or weekends. The convocation took two days out of my teaching. I can't afford to miss two days, considering all the material I have to cover." Roger Heyns, chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, has made the point that the faculty presumes a college campus to be an institution that almost by definition is to be free of tension. A president must make the faculty see the unreality of such a view in these turbulent times.

The president's domestic complexities are not confined to students, faculty, or academic administrators. He must give heed to campus police, secretaries, dormitory residents, business officers, and other nonacademic staff. They are an important and neglected element of the community. When three black students meet, a campus police officer suspects that they are up to no good. Secretaries may quake when approached by a black man whose appearance is not respectably middle class. Hippy garb and grooming can be comparable sources of difficulty. These nonacademic contacts can contribute considerably to campus tension.

Understanding Student Demands

The financing of higher education for lower-class blacks and other American minority groups is receiving considerable

attention at this time. An even more critical issue than finances is the question of what to do with such students once they arrive on campus. College presidents might begin to educate their constituencies concerning some of the implications of black studies. Militant blacks and their allies have thrown light on the hypocritical underpinnings of the "Land of the free and the home of the brave"—the slaughter of Indians, the unjust wars, slavery. They have helped to arrest the march of technology and scientism that a decade ago seemed destined to kill the humanistic spirit. They have greatly contributed to the realization that white, middle-class America does not necessarily walk hand in hand with God. And now they are taking on meritocracy, as exemplified by grades and degrees. They demand that colleges contribute to the development of students rather than that students be tailored to the abstract demands of professions, industry, and the like.

Such fundamental issues must be explained and placed within a framework of rational discussion. It may be that the conflicts besetting the urban campus cannot be solved by reason, but the president must live by the faith that rational debate is still useful. These are revolutionary times, and most middle-aged liberals are 10 or 15 years behind the times. They would have made good college presidents in 1955. They are of the alcohol rather than the drug generation.

In order to talk to dissident students today, a president must know where "they are at." He must grasp their sense of outrage and their spirit of anarchy, and recognize the grounds on which they justify confrontation and violence. He must appreciate the appeal of anti-thought. He must be able to talk to students in a language that is not dead. The manners, style, and language of rebellion are powerfully evocative. The worst of sins among dissident youth is not to feel. And tired old liberal rhetoric can smother feeling like a blanket.

None of this is to suggest that presidents abandon faith in democracy and the meliorative possibilities of the college. They must attempt to draw dissident students into that framework. But the tragic view is in order. They may not be successful in so influencing their students, and it may be that reform of the American system of higher education demands confrontation, that meliorative procedures will not work.

At all events, the time for playing it cool is past. I suggest that presidents eschew the role of behind-the-scenes diplomat and administrator and return to the 19th century concept of president as teacher and orator. Heaven knows, their constituencies have much to learn. They might begin by pointing out to rebellious students that while a revolution evokes an extraordinary sense of freedom and possibility, evocation of a mood is not a political end in itself. History indicates that revolutions cannot be expected to conform to plan, but some coherent vision of the post-revolutionary scene is nevertheless necessary. French students took over the Sorbonne and then did not know what to do with it. They thereby lost much support from the French citizenry. Exegesis of the true state of affairs in the governing of colleges and universities is badly needed. Abuse of the trustees is often misplaced. To be sure, trustees can wield power in tyrannical fashion. More often, however, policy is determined by the faculty. The view of Columbia University as a medieval fief ruled by President Kirk and the trustees is myopic. Rather, President Kirk and his trustees maintained a very loose hegemony over a series of duchies and baronies, the various departments, schools and colleges, most of which enjoyed considerable independence. Above all, a president must find suitable ways for students to participate in the operation of the institution. Only then will students assume true responsibility. Given the nature of campus government, which has grown by accretion, this is no easy task.

A president must hold up to his faculty and his nonacademic staff the picture of rigidity and intolerance in which all of us share. The times are too perilous to afford these luxuries. This is not to suggest that faculty members should abandon standards, but some openness and humility are in order. The president might remind a faculty member who is disturbed by disruptions of his class that in five years most of his students are not likely to remember his name, much less what they learned in the laboratory of Botany 1A on April 17. Above all, a president must exhort his faculty and staff to function in their professional environment as any mature citizen must live in our turbulent society—that is, tolerating much confusion and ambiguity. The faculty can ill afford short fuses and snap judgments. Some faculty members are quick to label almost all student protest and dissent an SDS plot to revolutionize American society. Such facile judgments needlessly polarize factions.

These days the chances are that the president who abandons the role of playing it cool and stands forth to exert moral force will be punished. The president of a complex urban institution faces an almost impossible task under the best of circumstances, and statistics show that they do not last long in their jobs. Like baseball managers they come and go, but unlike baseball managers their reasons for going are rarely publicized. A president who is fired for publicly standing by principle, whose firing therefore means something, is infinitely to be preferred to the president who goes out with a whimper, because he cannot do the near impossible—that is, hold the urban campus together. Certain elements of the public may enjoy the spectacle of a Socrates receiving his just rewards. A president, however, may inspire and unite his own constituency, his students and his faculty, by a display of moral leadership, a commodity which is usually in short supply and which appears to be critically lacking in the United States at this time.

Perhaps some foundation could assume the burden of aiding financially those true teachers among college presidents who lose their jobs by taking unambiguous stands on matters of intellectual and academic principle. Foundations have been known to do less rewarding things with their moneys.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

John U. Monro

Dean of Harvard College from 1958 to 1967, Dr. Monro is now director of freshman studies at Miles College, Birmingham, Alabama. Appointment to his present position was the result of a four-year association with Miles during which he spent the summers helping the college develop a new instructional program in writing for freshmen. A 1935 Harvard graduate, he was a staff writer for the *Boston Transcript* from 1937 to 1941. Following a five-year Navy tour during World War II, he returned to Harvard first as a counselor for veterans and later as director of the financial aid office.

Walter Clarence Daniel

Dr. Daniel is chairman of the division of Humanities at North Carolina A & T State University, and is president-elect of Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri. During the 1967-68 academic year he was on leave of absence from the position of department chairman to serve as director of the Thirteen Colleges Curriculum Development Program sponsored under Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act. He has held teaching and administrative positions in a number of colleges and universities in North Carolina and Ohio. His Ph.D. degree is from Bowling Green State University.

Finley Campbell

On leave from Morehouse College, where he has been on the faculty since 1960, Mr. Campbell is currently visiting professor of English at Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana. He is a graduate of Morehouse College and Atlanta University and is presently completing his Ph.D. degree in

American literature at the University of Chicago. In 1957 he studied French and English as a Fellow at the Sorbonne. A former television moderator and author of several articles dealing with race and politics, he is now a columnist for the *Atlanta Voice.*

W. Thomas Cottingham

Dr. Cottingham is dean of instruction at Gaston College, a position he has held since 1966. He is former dean of students, registrar and chairman of the psychology department at South Georgia College and has had extensive managerial experience in private industry. His Ph.D. degree in college administration was earned at Florida State University.

Gerald Shinn

Director of institutional research and development, Dr. Shinn is also assistant professor of philosophy and religion at Wilmington College. He has taught at Louisburg College and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. His interest in archeology led him in the summer of 1967 to Arad, Israel, where he served as assistant supervisor on the dig conducted by the Institute for Mediterranean Studies. He holds a Ph.D. degree from Duke University.

Donal S. Jones

Dr. Jones is chairman of the department of psychology at Federal City College. Before joining the staff of the new college in Washington, D. C., he was director of the experimental college at San Francisco State College. A former lecturer at Harvard, he holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of California at Berkeley.

Samuel D. Proctor

Dr. Proctor, former president of Virginia Union University and North Carolina A & T State University, is now university dean for special projects, University of Wisconsin. He has been an administrator in the Peace Corps, both in Washington and Nigeria, and for the National Council of Churches and the Office of Economic Opportunity. His Ph.D. degree in the field of ethics was earned at Boston University.

Dale V. Ulrich

Dr. Ulrich is dean of the college and professor of physics at Bridgewater College in Virginia. He has also taught physics at Madison College and the University of Virginia and worked as a practicing physicist for the National Bureau of Standards. His Ph.D. degree was awarded by the University of Virginia in 1964.

Mereb E. Mossman

Miss Mossman is dean of the faculty, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She has also served as dean of the college, dean of instruction and professor of sociology. For several years she headed the department of sociology at Ginling College, Nanking, China. Her L.H.D. degree was awarded by Queen's College, Charlotte, North Carolina.

Mervin B. Freedman

Dr. Freedman is professor of psychology at San Francisco State College. He has served as assistant dean of undergraduate education at Stanford University, as chairman of the psychology department at San Francisco State, and as a senior Fulbright research fellow at the University of Olso. For many years he was associated with the Mary Conover Mellon Foundation at Vassar College. His Ph.D. degree in psychology was earned at the University of California at Berkeley.

Sheraton -
Sir Walter Hotel
Raleigh, N. C.

Conference
Program

THE NEW COLLEGE TEACHER

Friday, November 8

6:00 p.m. — Social Hour (Red Room)

Dinner

Informal Meeting of Teachers

Saturday, November 9

9:00 p.m. — **PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES FACING THE NEW COLLEGE TEACHER** (Elizabeth Room)

Moderator

Donald P. Draine
Program Associate, RELCV

Panelists

Expectations versus Realities	John U. Monro, Chairman Freshman Studies, Miles College
Motivation: Turning Students On	Walter Daniel, Director Division of Humanities, North Carolina A & T State University
The Freshman Year and the Black Perspective	Finley Campbell, Visiting Professor, Wabash College
The Two-Year College	W. Thomas Cottingham Academic Dean, Gaston College

The College, the Curriculum and Reformation	Gerald Shinn, Professor and Director, Institutional Research, Wilmington College
10:30	Coffee Break
10:45	Questions and Answers
12:30	Luncheon (The Ball Room)
1:15 p.m.	**DISCUSSION: EXPERIMENTATION AND INNOVATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION** (Elizabeth Room)
	Moderator
	Junius A. Davis, Director ETS–Southeastern Office
	Discussion Leader
	Donal S. Jones, Chairman Psychology Department Federal City College
3:00 p.m.	Coffee Break
3:15 p.m.	**REFLECTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR**
	Presiding:
	Howard R. Boozer Vice President Elect, RELCV
	Speakers
General Aims and Functions of the College	Samuel D. Proctor University Dean University of Wisconsin
Policy and Decision Making	Dale V. Ulrich Dean and Professor of Physics Bridgewater College

Participation of New Faculty in the Total College Program	Mereb E. Mossman, Dean University of North Carolina at Greensboro
7:00 p.m.	Social Hour (Coffee House)
	Dinner
	Presiding:
	Howard R. Boozer
The College President as Teacher	**ADDRESS:**
	Mervin Freedman Professor of Psychology San Francisco State College

INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED

AT THE CONFERENCE

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
Barber-Scotia College
Belmont Abbey College
Catawba College
Davidson County Community College
Duke University
East Carolina University
Fayetteville State College
Gaston College
Kittrell College
Lenoir County Community College
Meredith College
Mount Olive Junior College
North Carolina A & T State University
North Carolina College - Durham
North Carolina State University
Saint Augustine's College
Southeastern Community College
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
Western Piedmont Community College
Wilmington College
Wingate College
Winston-Salem State College

SOUTH CAROLINA

Limestone College
Morris College
South Carolina State College
Voorhees College

VIRGINIA

Bridgewater College
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
Ferrum Junior College
Frederick Community College
Hampden-Sydney College
Hampton Institute
John Tyler Community College
Madison College
Mary Washington College
Virginia Military Institute
Virginia State College - Petersburg